Federal....

EUROPEAN

AND

BANTU

being

Papers and Addresses read at the Conference on Native Affairs

MISSIONARY RESEARCH LIBRARY NEW YORK CITY

Held under the Auspices of

The Federal Council of the D.R. Churches

at Johannesburg

on

27th to 29th September, 1923

Published for the Federal Council of the D.R. Churches

Obtainable from
Secr. S.A. BIBLE UNION, 9 Church Street, Cape Town
Secr. STUD. CHRIST. ASSOCIATION, Stellenbosch
MISSION BOOKROOM, Lovedale, Alice

Price: ONE SHILLING, Post Free.

Citadel Press, 128 Loop Street, Cape Town.

EUROPEAN

AND

BANTU

being

Papers and Addresses read at the Conference on Native Affairs

Held under the Auspices of

The Federal Council of the D.R. Churches

at Johannesburg

on

27th to 29th September, 1923

Published for the Federal Council of the D.R. Churches

Obtainable from

Secr. S.A. BIBLE UNION, 9 Church Street, Cape Town
Secr. STUD. CHRIST. ASSOCIATION, Stellenbosch
MISSION BOOKROOM, Lovedale, Alice

Price: ONE SHILLING, Post Free.

EUROPEAN AND BANTU.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
PREFACE.—Dr. C. T. Loram, M.A., L.L.B., Ph.D.	5
I. OPENING ADDRESS.—Rev. D. S. Botha, Moderator of the D.R. Church of the Cape Province.	7
II. THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIANITY AS A BASIS FOR A NATIVE POLICY.—Rev. A. F. Louw, Minister of the D.R. Church, Bloemfontein, O.F.S.	9
III. NATIVE EDUCATION.—Professor J. du Plessis, M.A. B.D., Lit.D., Professor Theol. Sem., D.R Church, Stellenbosch.	11
IV. THE ADMINISTRATION AND SCOPE OF AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.—Mr. D. D. T. Jabavu, B.A., Lecturer in the S.A. Native College, Fort Hare, Alice, C.P.	16
V. NATIVE LAND AND THE LAND ACT.—Professor W. M. Macmillan, M.A., Professor of History, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg	20
VI. NATIVES AND THE LAND ACT OF 1913.—Chief F. F. Zibi, of the Cape Province.	28
VII. SEGREGATION AS A FUNDAMENTAL PLANK IN S.A. NATIVE POLICY.—Dr. Edgar Brookes, M.A., Lit.D., Head of Dept. of Politics, Transvaal University College, Union of South Africa.	32
VIII. SEGREGATION.—Rev. Z. R. Mahabane, Wesleyan Minister, Vrede, O.F.S.	38
IX. RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE.	41
X. INTERVIEW WITH THE ACTING MINISTER OF NATIVE AFFAIRS.	46
XI. STATEMENT ON THE NATIVE LAND ACT.	52

PREFACE.

I have been asked to write a few words of introduction to this collection of the addresses given at the Conference on the Native question called by the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Church. I do this very willingly, not only because of the unusually high standard of the papers, which show that we have thinkers, both white and black, able to deal fully and thoroughly, yet at the same time constructively and moderately, with the many sides of the question, but also because I feel that the ever increasing interest in this problem deserves to be met and fostered by views and information such as contained herein. I feel that I should make it clear that the Conference of the Dutch Reformed Church, although attended by members of the Native Affairs Commission and the Department of Native Affairs, was entirely unofficial, and that the views expressed here are those of the writers alone.

It seems altogether fitting that this, the largest and most important unofficial Conference on Native Affairs ever held in South Africa, should have been called by the oldest, largest and most completely South African Church in the country. It seems to imply a recognition of the importance of the question by the Dutch-speaking as well as the English-speaking people of our country, the impossibility of a living church holding aloof from the greatest of our problems, even though social, economic, and even political issues are involved, an acceptance on the part of the churches of their responsibilities for having helped to create the problem, and their willingness to help in solving it, and the determination to regard this as a domestic matter to be settled in the long run by South Africa herself.

Many Europeans and many more Natives must have been surprised to see forty Europeans—ministers, missionaries, professional and business men—sitting down in open round table conference with an equal number of Natives—ministers, chiefs, teachers, labourers and even so-called "agitators"—and conducting a conference on a race question with rare skill, hard facts and the greatest good feeling. It seemed to me that I have never seen the old rule *"in dubiis libertas, in necessariis unitas, in omnibus caritas"* more effectively carried out. There were many differences in details of policy and methods of attack, but there was a surprising agreement on general principles, while throughout there was a feeling of friendliness and trust and a willingness to see the point of view of the other side. It was a good omen for the future.

In dubiis libertas. It seems certain that uniformity in the details of Native policy and methods of administration is quite impossible. Not only have we individual and tribal differences among them, but they differ in methods of living, standards of education and in the

political and administrative treatment they have received from the European. Let us not, then, bemoan the fact that in the Cape the Native has the vote, while in other Provinces he has not, or that the Zulu prefers tribal government to the "council system" of the Transkei, or that some Natives are industrialists and professional men and women whereas others are farmers and servants. To attempt to put all Natives into the reserves, or to make them all servants for the European, or to apply the same forms of government to all, or to have a uniform pass law, or in any way to make them all alike, would imperil their progress and our own.

In necessariis unitas. In the fundamentals of Native policy and administration, however, there is needed a standard and united opinion. We shall in the long run be compelled to admit it, that "segregation" is not a panacea for our racial ills, and that "differential treatment" is only possible to a limited extent. We must accept the principal that the Native needs education for his sake and our own though we may differ as to its form. We shall easily agree that he must pay for it, though we may differ as to the method or amount of the payment. We must make his taxation bear some relation to the benefit he receives from the State, though we may prefer a poll tax in the Transvaal and a hut tax in Natal. We can agree that the Native is entitled to justice but whether he should be judged by European or Native law can be disputed.

In omnibus caritas. Above all we must see to it that in our attempts at a solution, our policy and administration are founded upon the teachings of Christianity, and this in spite of the oft repeated statement that legislation and action on colour questions cannot be "squared" with the Sermon on the Mount." They *must* be so squared or else they will turn out to be no solutions at all. Both races need to exercise patience, understanding, a moderated expression of opinion and a willingness to discuss matters with the other side. Many are the ways of expressing this spirit of Christian charity, but a good beginning is to get together at a round table conference, to lay all the cards on the table, and to believe that the other side is just as honest and sincere as you are yourself.

It is expected that this book will be used by the Students' Christian Union and other school and college groups besides members of the general public. May one who has done much study of this subject remind others that the problem of race relationship calls for close study, deep thinking, long views, and that in the end the solution will be found to demand great sacrifices from both Black and White, but greater perhaps from the European than from the Native.

C. T. Loram.

Rondebosch, C.P.

April 6th, 1924.

I.—OPENING ADDRESS.

By the Rev. D. S. Botha, Moderator, Dutch Reformed Church.

Gentlemen, or rather, Brethren in Christ! In the name of the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, I extend to you all a hearty welcome to this Conference, at which we hope to discuss matters of the utmost importance to all inhabitants of this country.

We who are here to-day, differ from one another in many respects. We differ from one another in the colour of our skins. We belong to different races. We speak different languages. We are members of different Churches, and we worship God in different ways. In some respects, however, there is not the slightest difference between us. We are all human beings created after the image of God. We are all fallen sinners who have continually to deplore the depravity of our nature We are all in need of Salvation, and, as far as I know, we are all professing Christians. Under Divine direction we have come together with the holy desire to serve God, and to further the highest interests of the whole population of our country.

God-fearing men of great ability, who take a keen interest in the welfare of those who surround them, have been asked and have promised to address you on various important subjects. You will however permit me to make a few introductory remarks on the reason why we are here, the object we have in view, and the spirit in which we should try to gain our object.

Why are we here to-day? The natural reply to this question is that we are here because the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches, under Divine guidance, has invited us to this Conference. This is true, but you will admit that the invitation of that Council was only the means and not the cause of our meeting. The reason why we are here is the fact that there are weighty problems which wait for solution, problems which must be solved. We have problems in connexion with the Native Races generally; with the relation between White and Black; with the Rights (Political Rights and Rights to own land) of Natives, and especially in connexion with the Education and Evangelisation of the Native races.

Under Divine direction the white and black races are living in this country, and alas it is not clear to all, at least not clear to the vast majority what White and Black owe to one another, what duties they have to perform and what line of conduct they should follow. Instead of co-operatng with one another, they look upon each other—with some praiseworthy exceptions—with suspicion, antipathy and even emnity. This must, in my humble opinion, be ascribed to ignorance and misunderstanding.

The problems mentioned are the results of all this and this is what has brought us together here. We feel that unless these problems are properly solved the future will be a very dark one for all concerned.

What is the object we have in view? It is a fact that White and Black, although living in the same country, do not know each other well enough; the one section of the community does not understand enough of the trials and the burdens of the other section. The one race does not fully comprehend the aims and aspirations of the other race. Hence all the suspicion, antipathy and enmity. Now in order to remove this ignorance and misunderstanding which are the causes of so much that is harmful and dangerous, information should be given and information should be received. Our object at this meeting is to teach and to be taught by giving and receiving useful information on the race problems in our country. I hope that those who speak and those who listen to the speakers will bear in mind that we are here with the desire to remove ignorance and misunderstanding by means of reliable information, and that our chief aim is the glory of God and the temporal and spiritual welfare of the whole community.

Let me add to this a few remarks on the spirit in which we should try to gain our object. A subject of so much importance should be approached in the right spirit. The success of our Conference is largely dependent on the spirit in which we discuss the subject in question.

We should be here in the *spirit of honesty*. No one should try to conceal his thoughts by his words. We should not say what we do not mean. We should be open-hearted and open-minded, and boldly say what, in our opinion, ought to be said. Let us have the courage of our convictions.

We should be here in the *spirit of humility*. Scientific men say that in doing research work, they can only be successful if they are humble enough to admit their ignorance and to allow themselves to be taught. We should all on this occasion be willing to learn and be willing, if we hold strong views, to be convinced. Let us be humble enough to seek Divine guidance. "Except the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it."

We should seek the solution of our problems in the *spirit of love*. If we are moved in our efforts by love to God and love to man we shall be able tenderly, earnestly and perseveringly to teach one another and to allow others to teach us. Love makes us sagacious, and it also makes us forebearing and patient.

But we should be here especially in the *spirit of faith*. We should have faith in our cause, faith in one another, and above all, faith in God. Let us believe that the solution of the Native Problems is a possibility. Let us believe that good and noble intentions inspire all

who are here. Let us believe that our God who is good and wise and omnipotent, will guide us through His Spirit in our deliberations, and will crown our efforts with His blessing. We should be here under the influence of the Holy Spirit and in the Spirit of Jesus Christ whom we honour as our Prophet, our High Priest and our King. If we are here in this spirit we shall experience that our God is "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." May God in His infinite love bless our efforts far beyond our most sanguine expectations.

II.—THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIANITY AS A BASIS FOR A NATIVE POLICY.

Rev. A. F. Louw, Minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Bloemfontein North, was the author of the original proposal to convene this Conference. He spoke an introductory word on the above subject, and prefaced his remarks by a few explanatory sentences as to how the idea of convening such a Conference occurred to him, in the following words: "A human being, when he becomes conscious of his existence, opens his eyes, looks at his environment and begins to put questions. One of the first things a child, born in South Africa sees, is that he is in a country where all the people are not of the same colour nor of the same social standing. The European lad, who grows up in a Christian home, may in his childhood make the acquaintance of good honest servants, and he is taught to address these in a respectful way by the names of the "Outa" and "Ayah," and they greatly influence his young life. I see to-day a venerable old churchman, known by us children as "Outa April." How well I remember him! In the days of my childhood, his life played an important part in our home. I see him carry his simple bench from the kitchen and join in our family worship morning and night. I see him in his frock coat leave his clean, well ventilated, outside room on Sunday morning and go to his church, where he was an officer, respected by Europeans and Natives. In this church the Dutch minister had a simple service every Sabbath evening, which was very popular with us children and other Europeans who were also permitted to worship there. I see the old man with his spade in our neatly kept garden, which yielded nearly all the vegetables needed for the family. I hear him encourage us little ones, assisting us in our work around the old home. Distinctly do I remember his funeral, which was attended by European and Coloured mourners. Only last year, passing through that little village, situated so picturesquely upon the Sneeuwbergen, I visited the graveyard, with many memories of childhood coming back to me. To-day a photo of Outa April may be seen standing on the study table of the eldest son of that parsonage—a man, who has spent more than thirty years of his life as a missionary of the D.R. Church north of the Limpopo.

From the Christian homes, where April, Friek, Jantje, Gert, Sara Anna and others have worked, have come men and women, filling important posts in our land and in the mission field, one and all friends of the native, men and women who look upon their fellow men, never mind their colour, as human beings, created in God's image, men and women for whom the Highest in heaven came to this sinful world. We speak of the teaching of Christianity as a basis for a Native Policy—give me the Christian home and seven-eighths of the difficulties of the native problem will vanish.

For five years it has been my great privilege to do active missionary work, not by going to the field but by organising the home base. How can I even thank my Master for the privilege of visiting the majority of the D.R. congregations in the Union. The predominant impression made on me everywhere was that the friends of the Crucified One were the friends of the less privileged, the friends of the missionary cause and of the native, the followers of the Saviour of the world are those who give and pray for the missionary cause, they are the people who view the whole native question from the only sound and safe viewpoint in the Christian one.

Another factor which made me move the resolution to hold such a conference is the fact that the various European Christian Churches know too little of each other's work, and the Natives know too little what the various Christian Churches are doing for them. I felt that we should meet at a round table conference to learn to know and understand each other better, and in order to state clearly what the viewpoint is from which the Christian section of the European population in South Africa looks at the great and important native problem, not only in South Africa, but in the whole of Africa. The resolution, which was unanimously taken by the Federal Council of the four D.R. Churches in the four provinces of the Union, consisting of 340 congregations and 300,000 members, ran as follows: "The Council of the D.R. Churches appoints its President and Secretary to form a committee to summon a conference, consisting of representatives of all the Protestant Churches in South Africa, together with leaders in political circles, Europeans, Coloured men and Natives. The object of the conference shall be to get better acquainted with each other, and to confer together concerning the interests of Europeans, coloured and natives, who have been brought together by the hand of God in this country, from the viewpoint of a Christian civilization. The members of the Native Affairs Commission to be invited to attend the conference." The gratifying response which the invitation to this conference has met on all sides, shows that the resolution was a timely one.

Here we are gathered on this memorable day. To me personally it is one of the greatest days of my life. I now turn to our friends here, upon whom I look as leaders representing some five millions of human beings in our own South Africa. We declare that the only

safe and just Native Policy for Europeans and Natives to follow is one based on the teaching of Christianity. It must not be inferred that we thereby deny that there has been in the past some measure of the Christian spirit in our native policy. What I do declare is that the European Christian in this land, who is imbued with the spirit of his Master, does not look upon the African black man as an article for exploitation, as a mere asset for the gain of filthy lucre, but as a man made after God's own image and must be treated by him as such.

Leaders! and you who may become leaders of millions! May I ask whither are you going to lead your people? Are we going to quarrel and fight? Are we going to stand back to back, as in the past? To-day let us take our stand side by side, standing shoulder to shoulder, holding high the banner of Jesus Christ, unto whom the European, living in South Africa, owes his all, and, largely through the European, the Native owes ever so much. Let us not quarrel about accidentals, but let us be agreed about essentials, let us not ask what can I get from Africa and its people, but what can I give to this land with its hundred millions of black people, lying in darkness.

He who wants to get more and more may possibly get more than he meant, but may lose his soul. He who gives, follows in the footsteps of Him, Who gave His only Begotten Son. We have invited you here, friends, as members of churches, serving one common Master. Let us confer and live together, in this beautiful land of ours, remembering the words of the Apostle Paul: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Then only can a Native Policy based on the teaching of Christianity be successfully carried out."

III.—NATIVE EDUCATION.

By Rev. Prof. J. du Plessis, Litt.D.

The European population of South Africa occupies a position, with reference to its native problem, which is unique among the self-governing Colonies of the British Empire, and, indeed, among the self-governing States of the world. For to constitute a native problem in the true sense of the word three factors are necessary—natives, a native question, and a self-governing white community. In New Zealand you have 20 Europeans to every native, in Canada 80, in Australia a hundred; these States have natives, but no native question. Even in the United States the negro question is not really a negro problem, for the whites outnumber the blacks as ten to one. In the West Indies you have natives and a native question, but no self-government. In India there are natives and there is a burning native question, but no European community to deal with it. South Africa is unique in having a native population vastly outnumbering the whites, a native question of great actuality and complexity, and a self-governing white community that has to attempt its solution. . . .

What we do or leave undone is likely to have a determinative influence upon the policies of Governments ruling over other portions of our Continent. They recognise that we are " up against " the native problem in a sense in which no other European community is, that we have unique opportunities for studying it at first hand, and that we have the garnered experience of eight generations of ancestors to help us in solving it.

In the forefront of our native problem stands the question of native education. It embraces to some extent all phases of the native problem, for whatever the natives' aims or ambitions may be, in the religious, the social, the economic or the industrial sphere, education is both the base from which he must start and the road along which he must travel. Native education has been in full progress for a century. . . . Has it been in every respect a success? To this question missionaries, educationists and Government commissions have unanimously answered, No. . . .

THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

The counts of the indictment are chiefly three. First, it takes no account of the native's past. It is not rooted in his national and tribal traditions, it disparages his social system, neglects the study of his laws, customs, folklore, and so tends to estrange him from his own people and his own past. It is, in one word, unpatriotic.

Secondly, it takes no account of the native's present stage of development. The European's educational system has grown with the growth of his nationality. It is the result of a long evolutionary process. It presupposes certain inherited capabilities, certain intellectual powers, and a certain moral stamina, which we can hardly look for in a race just emerging from barbarism. Upon this race we have nevertheless imposed an educational system which, while it very well fits our stage of development, may be (and most likely will be) quite unsuited to that of the native. Such a system is bound to be unpsychologic.

Thirdly, our present system takes no account of the native's future aims and needs; it is unpractical. It imparts book-learning solely, and leads the native to look upon that as the be-all and end-all of education. It has thus encouraged the pernicious idea that education is devised to save the native from the necessity of working with his hands. He may soil his fingers with scribbler's ink, but not with honest manual toil. Older missionaries, it is just to say, saw this defect in the prevailing system as clearly as we do. Writing about 20 years ago of the enthusiasm for education, which became apparent among the natives in the 'seventies of last century, the Rev. J. Whiteside says, in sentences which I have ventured to compress: " Natives have an almost phenomenal facility for acquiring knowledge. In a few months they can speak English, and in a year or two they find no difficulty in passing an examination in the lower standards; but their knowledge is superficial and this ready acquirement is largely due to their retentive memory and their marvellous gift of imitation. They speedily become vain of their attainments and shun physical toil. True education does not consist in cramming the mind with processes and facts, but in bringing out what is

best in a man or a woman for practical use in daily life." In these words Whiteside lays bare one of the chief imperfections of the system of education that has hitherto prevailed. Recommendations in the direction of greater adaptation of methods to needs have been frequently made. These recommendations find their most recent expression in the report of the Cape Provincial Commission on Native Education (1919).

CONTROL OF EDUCATION.

Passing now to a consideration of the control of native education, we are faced with the fact that Governments generally are assuming an ever larger share in the direction of educational affairs. Hitherto native education has been almost everywhere a purely missionary concern, towards which Governments have exercised a wise toleration or have even extended actual financial support. But in recent years a change has come over the scene. Governments are no longer content to stand aside and give the missionaries a free hand. On the contrary, the ruling powers have come to regard education as a means of uniting and consolidating diverse tribes and peoples into a homogeneous whole with a common culture. Education thus becomes an important factor in the creation of national ideals and the realisation of national aims and ambitions.

Hence the opposition, avowed or tacit, of Governments such as the French and Portuguese, to the entrance of non-national missionaries into the colonies ruled by them. Hence the prohibition of the use of the native language in mission schools, and the enforcement of the national language, French or Portuguese, as the case may be. Hence the suppression of the vernacular as a means of propagating Christianity, for French and Portuguese regulations forbid the publication of even the Scriptures in the speech of the people.

Matters have not yet come to such a pass in South Africa. It is to be hoped they never will. With us the Government still leaves to the missionary the direction of native education, while seconding his efforts with indispensable grants-in-aid. With us education, native education, is still primarily a process to be utilised and controlled for intellectual and moral aims. But the fact remains that even in British African colonies (where missionary enterprise is unhampered by restrictive regulations) the Government is claiming a larger say in educational matters, and is increasingly utilising education for the attainment of political and cultural ends. In the Gold Coast Colony, in Southern and in Northern Nigeria the Government has established its own system of native schools alongside of existing mission schools; and in Natal, too, the Government has taken over some 50 schools from missionary bodies, and is now running them as a purely Government concern. These facts suggest the question whether the missionary societies should not resign all their schools to Government, and get them put upon the footing of our undenominational public schools for European children.

To such a proposal there are weighty objections. Sole Government control of mission schools must, I think, be resolutely opposed for the following reasons: it would involve loss of personal initiative, loss of local interest, loss of elasticity, and loss of the religious motive. There would be, I say, loss of private and personal initiative. For education, as the Calcutta University report has well said, is " not wholly a matter of public concern; it lies across the boundaries which divide public functions from private initiative, and it is therefore desirable to seek some form of synthesis between State supervision and private effort."

VALUE OF RELIGIOUS MOTIVE.

Conscious as we are of the tendency towards the secularisation of education in Government schools, we must surely feel it incumbent upon us as a Christian Congress to set our faces against the establishment of Government schools, pure and simple. In South Africa, happily, the Government has always shown itself desirous of retaining and emphasising the religious aspect of our native educational system. Government Commissions, like the Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5 and the Native Education Commission of 1908, have dwelt strongly upon the necessity of looking to religious and moral instruction as the principal factor in the uplift of the native races. Moreover, the South African Government has hitherto left the application of the native educational system largely in the hands of the missionary societies. But the share which missionaries have in native education ought to be considerably increased. They should be invited, as Dr. Loram suggests in his able monograph, " The Education of the South African Native," to play a larger part in the administration of native education, which, without their pioneering efforts and fostering care, would never have been what it is to-day.

It is unhappily an undeniable fact that even in mission schools religious instruction is in danger of being ousted by the secular subjects of the curriculum. The remedy lies ready to hand. We must insist that religious instruction shall be a subject of examination. In spite of our religious divergences this is not an unattainable ideal. We have an excellent catechism for school use, which should be translated into our vernaculars, and immediately introduced into our native schools to safeguard the rights of religious instruction.

From this digression on the urgent matter of religious teaching in native schools I return now to the subject of Government control. The right " form of synthesis " between the Government and missionary effort is, as the Calcutta Report suggests, indirect control and pecuniary support on the part of the Government, direct control and personal interest on the part of the missionary society. To the indirect control exercised by the Government would belong the determination of questions of educational policy, the introduction of suitable syllabuses, and the grading of schools and teachers.

It is, I think, of supreme importance that the administration of native education be completely separated from the administration of European education. As long as the two systems are under a common

direction the tendency of reversion to type will assert itself. The native educational system must be allowed to develop on independent, truly Bantu lines, which it will never do while it remains an adjunct and pale imitation of the European system. Native education should be entrusted to a special department, functioning in close co-operation with the Native Affairs Commission, and, like the latter, responsible to Parliament alone. This implies, of course, that it shall no longer be controlled by the Provincial Councils, and that a uniform educational policy shall be adopted for the natives of all the provinces of the Union.

THE POLITICAL PROBLEM.

But this divorce of native education from European education should form part of a policy which has larger ends in view. One of the subjects proposed for discussion by the agenda paper is "Segregation as a Fundamental Plank in Native Policy." The wording is suggestive. "Segregation" is practically what this paper suggests as urgently necessary in the domain of education. Other speakers will show the application of the policy of segregation in the social, the industrial, and the commercial spheres. Ought we not, in consistency, to apply the same policy in the political field? At the risk of trenching upon ground allotted to subsequent speakers, I would venture here to express my profound conviction that segregation is as necessary in matters of politics as in matters of education or domicile. It is futile for the natives of South Africa to hope to be fused into one and the same political system with the Europeans. They are not ripe for it; it will do them no good; and—this must be said, and I trust no one will put the wrong construction on my words—in the present temper of white South Africa they will never reach it. I cannot stop to argue the question: I merely record my conviction.

If this is so, why then should the native insist upon what he conceives to be his "natural rights" by straining after the deceptive ballot-box and battering at the inhospitable doors of Parliament? Should he not rather emulate the wisdom of the fox, and instead of breaking his back in vain attempts at the unattainable say resignedly, "The grapes are sour"? Develop your own educational system, my native friends, hold by your own social traditions, advance along your own economic lines and work out your own political salvation. Remember that you are Bantu, not Boers or Britishers, and let pride of nationality impel you to the pursuit of national aims and the achievement of national ambitions, within the wide constitutional scope which our commonwealth allows you.

I plead then for segregation in education, segregation in domicile, segregation in the social and in the political sphere. This does not mean that we may never meet and co-operate. That would be a selfish and unpatriotic policy, even if it were economically possible. We are members of the same social order and mutually essential to each other's welfare. To use Booker Washington's famous simile, we may be separate as the fingers in matters in which segregation is advisable, and yet one as the hand in things pertaining to our mutual progress.

IV. THE ADMINISTRATION AND SCOPE OF AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

By Mr. D. D. T. Jabavu, B.A. South African Native College, Fort Hare.

The importance of native education in the task of the future adjustment of the amicable relations between black and white can hardly be exaggerated, because with any race on the globe, once an interest is awakened in modern wonders of civilisation by contact with Europeans, the march of education cannot be arrested by any artificial barriers. We are all witnesses that a sort of education is constantly going on, conscious or unconscious.

One of the first things we must rid our minds of is the mistaken but disastrous assumption that the education of the native will, of necessity, be a danger to the European. The danger lies in a useless education for which there is no outlet in practical life. For it is calculated eventually to make him as much a burden on the land as the "poor white." Native education is now inevitable, and we have no choice in the matter, for the native has made up his mind to get it, and is getting it somehow; and, as one writer says, the question is not what kind of education shall we give him, but what will he accept from us. The people are keen, and so are the teachers and the children. For example, I may here mention one school near my own home, with a roll of 289, average attendance 260, pupils in standards V. and VI. on roll being 40, average attendance 38, many of whom have to walk several miles to school—a remarkable record of keenness. The manager is a native minister, and there is no compulsion for attending. The teacher for standard III. is a man with eight years of creditable experience in the school, and has a family, educating his children on a salary of £16 a quarter, without house or field! How he "comes out" financially I leave to your imagination.

That is typical of conditions in the Cape Province, which is admittedly the most progressive and liberal in the Union towards native education. In the Transvaal, I believe, the conditions are less good, while in the Orange Free State they touch the bottom. In Natal the conception and the plan of work, though not yet fully developed, gives us the nearest approach to the ideal which should form the type for the whole country.

It will help us in our attitude towards this question to remember that we are not being asked merely to exercise Christian charity in determining the system for native education that should prevail in this country. The black races, by reason of their considerable contribution to State revenue, possess a strong and just claim to the best available system that can be divised by modern authorities. In 1921 the Transvaal natives paid £350,000 in pass fees, plus £420,000 in poll tax, a total of £770,000, and in return for this received only £48,000 towards their education. In the Orange Free State the hut tax realised £73,000, and the State gave only £5,000 towards their education. So that the claim may be taken as proven.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION.

Assuming that we are agreed that the natives are entitled to the best system of education, let us address ourselves to the administration and content of such a system. The elements that enter into the consideration of the administration are the existing authorities responsible for the present mode of guidance. They are The Union Government, the Provincial Councils, the missionaries, missionary boards of advice, missionary managers or superintendents or grantees, native councils, the Departments of Native education, chief inspectors, district inspectors, native supervisors, native teachers' associations, possibly others.

It is our duty, I take it, to formulate here some reasonable and practical plan calculated to produce the best and most fruitful results, which we may recommend to the Government with a reasonable expectation of its possible and probable adoption.

The first principle I would like to place before this conference is that, before everything else, we should recommend that all native education be placed under the direct management of the Union Government instead of the Provincial Councils. For this we can constitutionallly base our case on section 147 of the Union of South Africa Act, which literally vested all "control and administration of native affairs. . . . in the Governor-General in Council. This clearly overrides the delegation of native elementary education to the Provincial Councils, notwithstanding that it was at the time found more convenient by the Cabinet to adopt that course in which they were, by this same Act, justified.

We have overwhelming evidence to-day that the time has come for the Cabinet to shoulder its responsibility in accordance with the spirit of the Union Act and to devise machinery for so doing. The re-arrangement of officials would not involve additional expenditure; on the contrary it might effect economy so far as officialdom is concerned. Nor would additional revenue be desirable from the natives, as they already pay more than they are getting in this direction.

The natives themselves are not inarticulate on this; they have made themselves heard time and again before the Native Affairs Commission. I remember one elderly man making a pathetically impassioned plea against the innumerable taxes he and his people were forced to pay by the Divisional and Provincial Councils as against the one hut-tax of the "big Government." He delivered a memorable tirade against the road tax, the dog tax, the dipping tax, the wheel tax and the Provincial Property Tax before the Native Affairs Commission in a giant meeting at Keiskama Hoek in 1921.

For the demand that native education be all managed by the Native Affairs Department, the commissioners, in their 1921 report, quote the Cape Native Teachers' Association resolutions at Kingwilliamstown and Alice, Natal native teachers' conference at Maritzburg; Transvaal Teachers' Association at Johannesburg; Native Education Board at Bloemfontein; and the Federation of Native Teachers' Associations of South Africa. Among the reasons mentioned are these: (a) Inequalities of treatment with regard to grants; (b) multiplicity of taxes and harassing methods of taxation; (c) neglect of the interests of native education in

the matter of school buildings, the salaries of native teachers, and equipment, by comparison with the generosity the Provincial Councils show towards Europeans, Indians and coloureds, (d) the Provincial Councils do not raise funds by taxes to benefit native education; (e) the interposition of Provincial Councils unnecessary and disadvantageously puts natives out of touch with the benefits of the Departments of Agriculture (which annually disburses funds amounting to £800,000), Health £250,000, and Public Works, £800,000, etc., all to which the natives contribute considerably in taxation. These arguments, it seems to me, are irresistible and are worthy of serious attention everywhere.

SUGGESTED ORGANISATION.

Presuming that we are agreed on the principle of placing all native education directly under the Ministry of Native Affairs, we must next show the feasibility of the proposal.

The head of the department will be the Minister for Native Affairs. He would have a Secretary for Native Education who would work in close consultation with two advisory bodies; (a) a departmental conference of three superintendents covering the whole Union (one resident at Kingwilliamstown for the Cape and Transkei, one at Maritzburg for Natal and Zululand, and the other at Johannesburg for the Transvaal and Orange Free State); (b) a Union Board of Native Education (composed of the Secretary for Native Affairs and the Native Affairs Commission), the Secretary for Native Education being a member of both boards. These bodies must, by special legal arrangements, work in close connection with other representative bodies of missionaries, magistrates, inspectors of native schools, native supervisors, native teachers' associations, and those of European teachers in native schools. This administration, according to the scheme in the 1921 report of the Native Affairs Commission, to which I am largely indebted for the suggestion, will fix a uniform system for all native education on the following basis: (1) Sub-primary schools taking pupils up to standard 2; (2) primary schools taking pupils up to standard 4; (3) intermediate schools taking pupils in standards 5 and 6; (4) high schools taking pupils over standard 6; (5) training colleges taking pupils over standard 6; (6) trade and industrial schools; (7) native night schools; (8) the South African Native College.

SCOPE OF NATIVE EDUCATION.

The paper here deals at some length with the practical details arising out of the scheme of administration outlined above. These include the provisions of inspectors, Government schools (which it is argued ought to be provided for natives as well as for Europeans and Indians), expending on native education, salaries of native teachers (which are shockingly low), and provision of funds.

The writer proceeds: Just as the best suggestions on administration are to be found in the 1921 report of the Native Affairs Commission, so the most illuminating information on content is to be obtained from the following three sources: (a) the 1919 report of the Cape Native Education Commission; (b) the Phelps-Stokes report "Education in

Africa " (of which I made a review and examination in the issues of " Imvo Zabantsundu," last July and August); (c) Dr. C. T. Loram's book " The Education of the South African Native."

In all these authorities it is agreed generally that the scope of native education should be limited only by the capacity of the student to benefit thereby. The principal objects should be the moulding of a good character, intellectual development, a sound training in manual activities, so as to befit the recipient pupil for his social environment through the hereditary racial instincts, and to prepare for practical usefulness in the country of one's birth.

The main criticism has been that the pioneers of native education had mistakenly and slavishly followed the now discredited over-bookish character of ancient European systems. The great need to-day is for a new orientation, bringing in more and more of vocational training on the lines of Booker Washington's Tuskegee Institute (the work of which I have endeavoured to describe in the " Black Problem," with a special view to its adaptation to the needs of South African natives).

In this country it is the Natal system which approaches to this ideal. In this connection there are four things that need particualr emphasis: agriculture, industries, civics and hygiene. The Cape Education Department has already endeavoured to apply the training in elements of agriculture from the lowest classes to the highest, this being continued right through the South African Native College, among all students without distinction. The effect is that in many schools there are garden plots where the children raise various kinds of vegetables. One enterprising teacher in the Middledrift district, who is a member of a Native Farmers' Association, would not be daunted by the lack of supplies. He raised by means of a concert and public collection a number of picks and spades, took his boys down by the local river bank while the girls took sewing, fenced in a plot with wild bush, cultivated a new garden which he watered from the stream and raised a crop of greens that took the inspector by suprise.

In industries much is being done at the Cape and Natal in grass work, mats, pottery, clay modelling, osier baskets, spinning, fencing and hat weaving—industries in which the Bantu are adepts.

Civics and hygiene are taught only in Natal schools, so far as I am aware. These studies should be extended, and there is no need to labour their value.

ORGANISATION.

The following scheme, from Dr. Loram's book, is to be commended for the general organisation of the whole of native education:—From the sub-standards to standard IV. should be the minimum which every one should get the opportunity to acquire, including manual workers, store boys, domestic servants and home-makers.

Standards V. and VI. constitute the higher or intermediate schools. All native police, lower clerks and interpreters, messengers and domestics should have gone through this stage.

The next stage is that of high schools, teachers' training institutions, agricultural schools, and trade schools. Above this is the higher

education stage, which should be provided at the South African Native College, embracing academic training for ministers, teachers, high school teachers, supervisors, professional medical and legal practitioners, clerks, interpreters, bookkeepers, farmers, farm demonstrators, farm overseers, nurses, artisans, housekeepers, foremen, and so forth.

From this sketch it will be observed that the just claim and legitimate ambition of black men who appreciate the value of their contact with the European races, as has been ordained by Providence, is that in return for the funds they contribute in taxes to the State, they shall be enabled to be educated so as to make the most of their innate powers and of their environment. While we are told that the whites contribute twenty times as much as do the blacks to State funds, we happen to know also that they receive for their education fifty times what we get; so that not only are the scales of justice uneven, but there is absolutely no case for the additional taxation of natives for their education. They already pay more than is adequate to provide them with an excellent system. I claim to say this with a full knowledge of their needs and aspirations as well as a mandate of their trust and confidence.

V.—NATIVE LAND AND THE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIVES LAND ACT OF 1913.

Professor W. M. Macmillan, M.A., University of Witwatersrand.

The difficulty of the land question needs no argument. I would hazard at the outset one simple propositon; that the land question is the native question; only adding that it always has been, and that land will remain, the essential condition of any permanently satisfactory solution.

(1) The kafir wars, till 1853 at least, and outside the Cape still later, were wars for land—their objective was not the Fish River bush, as a base desired by the kafirs for cattle-lifting, but the attractive pasture lands below the Winterberg and Katberg, the districts from Bedford to Kingwilliamstown. (2) These wars were fought between rivals bands of advancing colonists, white and black, in search of the pasture they needed; their result so far as concerned the old Cape Colony was to confine the kafirs for the most part to land beyond the Kei. (3) In Natal and the old Republics the land was largely cut up into white farms, almost totally regardless either of the problem presented by the existence of the native population, or of the capacity of the new white owners for effective and beneficial occupation. In the Orange Free State, the "Conquered Territory" tells the tale in its name. (4) This, however, is not to say that the Bantu were wholly innocent. They were sometimes the aggressors. They appealed to the sword and by the sword they fell. Nor did they fall only by white swords. In particular it was by their own internal wars that they left a large area, including fertile Natal, even if only temporarily a desert, and the fatal years of the wars of Chaka and Moselikatze and others opened the way to white occupation in the interior.

RESULTS OF KAFIR WARS.

The result of a century of wars has been, as with other wars, to create new problems rather than to solve any. (a) In the early days the problem was military, and like most military problems, comparatively easy of solution. But even yet the size and efficiency of our Defence Force are almost the chief tribute we pay to "our greatest problem." Now, however, it has become a far harder question of social economic organisations. (b) To-day, old Kafir Land, about Kingwilliamstown, and Alice, is a congested area. Reserves everywhere are crowded. In Natal and Transvaal, in the latter about one-third of the whole, masses of natives are "squatters" on European-owned land. There they sit, with no security of tenure for themselves, and encouraging the evils of absentee landlordism on the part of whites, detached from tribal organisation, and presenting a difficult problem of administration. (c) It is a black problem, but it is white made. The natives after all are squatters because, in the past, white land-hunger made no sufficient provision of lands for natives, and because there is now no other land for them.

As to the policy of drift which has persistently treated the native population as presenting only a military or police problem, I must take this opportunity of a largely missionary conference to pay tardy tribute, suggested by years of study of his own papers, to the memory of the best-abused missionary leader in all the history of South Africa, the Rev. Dr. John Philip.

(i.) The missionaries almost alone, and chiefly John Philip, showed in the old days a statesmanlike grasp of the fact that the natives must live, and that black and white must somehow subsist together in the same sub-continent. Dr. Philip especially saw all along (a) that the problem was a land problem, and could be dealt with by marking off separate white and black areas, and (b) that, on the side of the colonists, colonial dispersion over an ever larger area, however induced by economic stress, was fatal to healthy intensive agricultural development.

(ii.) After Philip's death in 1851 the policy he feared went on with little check. White expansion covered most of South Africa with a thin sprinkling of colonists to the wholesale "extermination" (as he called it, using the word in its literal classical sense) or uprooting of the native population. The result was, of course, the overcrowding, the socially and economically disastrous squatting of natives which in the early 20th century began to call urgently for some drastic remedy.

So (iii.) time has its revenges. In its central principle the Land Act of 1913, little as its authors dream, reverts at last to Dr. Philip's principle of separate white and black areas. Then, indeed, the policy might have been carried out with little hardship and with great and lasting benefit to white and black alike (but perhaps this would have asked almost impossible foresight of statemen and colonists alike). Now, the danger is that the measure is born, not of a passion for justice to the weaker race, but too much as a defensive, i not a selfish, measure for the benefit of the dominant white race.

THE NATIVES' LAND ACT.

Thus the new-old policy came to be laid down in the Natives' Land Act, 1913, which lays down the principle of native and non-native areas.

(i.) By clause 1 natives are prevented from the "purchase, hire or acquisition" of land in non-native areas, certain limited scheduled native areas being similarly closed to non-natives. But while this clause is largely in operation, clause 2, which was an integral part of the Act and was to make "further provision" for natives, remains a dead letter.

(ii.) The native areas scheduled are avowedly a minimum, and consist, for the most part, it should be emphasised, of lands, reserves and locations already secured to the natives by treaties, solemn agreements or even by legislation. They include, e.g., in Natal, the areas secured to natives by the action of the Imperial Government before the grant of self-government, and in the Transvaal the locations set apart over a long term of years by Commissioners appointed under the Pretoria Convention, 1881.

(iii.) To make "other provision" the Act appointed a Commission to report in two years. The Beaumont Commission accordingly, after some delay, suggested "additional" native areas, but in 1917 a Select Committee of the House found these suggestions inadequate or unsatisfactory, and local committees under Messrs. Scully, Stubbs, etc., continued the investigations and recommended still further areas. And there—for reasons known and unknown—the matter rests after 10 years.

(iv.) For the rest, the Act contemplates the elimination of the native squatter but looks after supposed farming interests by allowing the "labour-tenant" (who is defined as a native doing at least ninety days' work for the landowner). It lays down that in the Transvaal there shall be no restriction in the number of these labour-tenants, but on the other hand it does provide that "until Parliament has made other provision" no native resident, being a registered taxpayer, on any farm in Natal or Transvaal shall be liable to penalties or expulsion.

(v.) A mass of provisos makes it extraordinary difficult for anyone, and especially for the natives concerned, to say how far the Act is in operation or not at the present time. By a 1917 judgment of the Supreme Court, on the ground that nothing in the Act should prevent a native of the Cape from acquiring franchise qualifications, it was ruled that the Act is of no validity in the Cape of Good Hope. This conference has had ample evidence of the unsettlement caused in the native mind both by the Act and by its uncertainties.

As to the pros and cons of the Act, then, there certainly are cons. (i.) In brief, the chaos which has resulted suggests that it was an amazingly ill-digested measure and that most thorough inquiry into its working ought to be undertaken by Government and Parliament at the earliest possible moment.

But in its favour, (ii.) there is one central point. The basic principle of separate areas is undoubtedly sound and a solid gain to the natives. The policy of natives and of all right-thinking people should be to concentrate on "further provision" of land being made at once, and made

reasonably adequate. The history of the last century has proved abundantly (twice over in the fate of the Griquas, first in the south of the Free State and then in Griqualand East) that open economic competition in land is fatal to the weaker race. Given free right of entry of whites into native lands, the native will presently be landless indeed.

LAND ACT AND NATIONAL POLICY.

It is evident that any progress towards a satisfactory realisation of this central principle by making " further provision " of land for natives depends on white public opinion and its influence in Parliament. In this audience one may appeal to a sense of ordinary justice, but outside, native rights have to be secured against a dead weight of inertia, and, much less, active opposition. Effective appeal lies therefore not to abstract justice but to white interests, and I would essay the task of proving that the best and only hope for white prosperity in this land is a really generous attempt to meet native aspirations, above all in this matter of land.

To this end what is needed is a completely new orientation. (i) The basic ground of white opposition to the provision of adequate native land is the feeling, sometimes only sub-conscious, that there is no land to spare. How, it is asked, can we set aside more land for natives in face of the bitter need of tens of thousands of our own landless class, the poor whites? (ii.) Somewhat less rooted and formidable is the fear of various interests that to provide more land will diminish the supply of native labour on farms and in mines and industries.

On these two fundamentals of the native difficulty, land and labour, I suggest without hesitation that the confusion implicit in and resulting from the Act of 1913 (sometimes spoken of as the basis of our native policy) is a measure of the confusion of thought which now reigns. Our national lack of policy in regard to these, its two leading strands, is fundamentally confused and contradictory. (a) Under the Act, and always, policy is designed to end squatting, limit labour-tenancy and make full-time native servants, or, in other words, to give another squeeze to the native labour sponge—and to get more native labour. (b) At one and the same time, on the railways and in forests, the Government is committed to encouraging the use of white labour. The latest attempt is to encourage white labour even on the farms; in a word, to use less native labour.

The Press champions of a " White South Africa Policy " betray the same confusion of thought. (a) They stoutly oppose immigration of native labour from north of Latitude 22deg. South, and approve of the restriction on Portuguese for the mines—a policy, that is, of restricting native labour; (b) at the same time they are never done urging the development, not so much of land which is indisputably white, and undeveloped, as of the almost untouched low veld, or even Zululand. The latest cry, from the highest quarters downwards, is of the " untold possibilities " of lands hitherto untouched, for the production of cotton.

But in all their concern for " development " they concentrate on white needs. As if it is possible to make a " white " South Africa with-

out giving a thought to what is to become of the vast native population. They ignore utterly the inevitable consequences of still further white expansion on the old lines, which can only result in the displacement of natives in the few areas remaining to them, and drive still more of them into unsettlement, and into the labour market. The White South Africa Party leave completely on one side the question of land for natives, but it is only by keeping them on the land, that there is any real hope of keeping the natives out of undue competition with those whites for whom we all would find places and employment.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL POLICY.

(A) Land—(1) For the unemployed and the poor whites, what is needed is not more expansion and more land, but more intensive use of the areas we have. (On the face of it effective expansion requires even more capital than development in already partly developed areas, and what we need—to absorb our present white surplus is more work on the land—not merely land). (2) The root of most of our troubles in history is, I submit, expansion beyond our strength. The Great Trek itself, heroic though it be, was an economic disaster, reinforcing the ill-effects of the Dutch Company's policy which first induced the scattering of farms in the 18th century. (3) This over-expansion and the appropriation of land without development is the root of the evil of native squatting, the native having no alternative. But native pressure on what land is left to him has been most systematicaly reinforced by taxes, and other measures designed for the very purpose of forcing him into the labour market, into what is now becoming disastrous competition with the white population. Again this competition is not of the natives' choosing. (4) In a word, if natives certainly misuse and underuse, or overuse, the land they have, so do the whtes, with all their advantages. The hope of South Africca is always in its "great future." But at the present moment, on the whole, the standard of our white agriculture is wretched.

Hence (5) if, as for example the Stubbs Report suggests, demarcation of adequate native areas may tend to lock up land unbeneficially for a while, then I am tempted to assert, not only with Mr. Stubbs, that this is necessary, but even with all deliberation, a very good thing, too. For (6) the economic cause of the poor white problem being this over-expansion of the white community, any attempt to solve it by still more expansion is merely to defer hope of any radical solution. The only solution is in fact concentration on agricultural efficiency. And this involves a definite breach with the past which has sought relief only through the acquisition of still more land; it demands an agricultural revolution from the dispersed pastoralism of former generations to intensive agriculture, or even, if it is intensive to intensive pastoralism.

(B) Native Labour.—With regard to the second strand of our national policy: (i.) The argument at the moment is that more native labour is necessary for the absorption of unemployed whites. But, in reply, the temporary, and especially the fluctuating needs of the mines or of any other industry are frankly no possible basis for a fixed national policy.

For (ii.) to take one crucial test. At present there is a relatively small native unemployment problem. (Not that there is none. Many boys roaming the streets "looking for work" inevitably drift into vagrancy and crime. Moreover, probably thousands of natives even on this Rand of ours, have no permanent home except in such native housing as we provide). But if the problem is still slight, it is because the bulk of the natives still have a reserve to fall back upon in their kraals. Are we then—are our enlightened industrial leaders—prepared to continue the present reckless policy of so continuously squeezing the natives that the great bulk of them, and not only the remnant as at present, will soon have no roots in the land? Can a national policy contemplate with equanimity the steep descent which is leading (more than ever since the application of the half-born Land Act) to the abyss? Before long our present policy will have evolved a landless black proletariat.

THE LABOUR SUPPLY.

There is, however, another line of argument on this point. I think there is evidence that even now we are not getting the best use out of our available supply of native labour. (i.) Passing the point that, as the Scully Report suggests (par. 15), labour conditions for South African employers are quite unusually favourable, and that they might be more thankful than they are that they are not situated like those of Canada or Australia. (ii.) I would emphasise the point, hinted at on the high authority of the Lagden Report (1903-05, par. 183) that at present a certain amount of farm labour is "unreasonably tied up."

Thus (a) the labour-tenant, bound for 90 days per annum, quite often lets his 90 days spread over the year, and added to this, the pass laws are in a measure restrictive. (b) There is clear evidence that farmers on the borders of a native location congratulate themselves on their facilities for obtaining all the labour they require. Therefore (c) the present reserves and locations are a more useful reservoir of labour than are the white farms with native tenants, and there is no reason to suppose that more adequate reserves would not be equally so.

On the contrary, I conclude on this point (a) that the problematical needs of fortunate masters of labour-tenants act, along with restrictive pass laws, as a serious check on what is most desirable—the fluidity or mobility of labour. Like the old English Poor Law Settlement Acts, our present policy hampers the readiness of labour to flow easily to the point where it is most needed, and perhaps, especially, to where it gives and gets the best return. (b) The effect of putting an end to the excitement and unsettlement already caused by the Land Act, the establishment of a reasonable certainty that there is land for them to return to, a fixed and guaranteed land holding, will have only a beneficial effect in promoting a desire to leave their land for a term. It will give the native labourer a new use for the wages he may earn, and an element of hope which is the best possible stimulus and spur to progress.

The conclusion then is that the best hope alike for white and black is to put the clauses of the Land Act which propose to make "further provision" of native land into operation, with generosity, and as speedily as possible.

APPLYING THE ACT.

It remains to discuss the question of how to apply the Act. (1) It is most important to make the changes contemplated, for example with regard to squatting, as gradual and smooth as possible. It is the height of political unwisdom to attempt to hasten fundamental social changes in anything less than one generation. Safe and wise national policy demands that the obvious excitement and agitaton already aroused by this Act be allayed by the next steps. (2) I could, therefore, commend and emphasise the wisdom of the Stubbs Report in two particulars: (a) That it will be more than sufficient for the purpose aimed at to prohibit fresh squatting agreements; (b) that nothing must be done to create such a wholesale uprooting of the present population as will swamp any newly defined native areas with a sudden rush of the uprooted immigrants. (3) It need hardly be added that while social and administrative reasons suggest the desirability of making native areas as compact as possible, yet the principle of gradual change makes it inevitable that for some time to come considerable areas must be proclaimed "neutral," and open to white and black.

Given this principle of gradual development of the policy underlying the Act, we may continue (1) That the native people will be well advised to accept as a basis of demarcation such quite moderate calculations of their needs as those made by the Stubbs Report (which I take the opportunity of commending to students of the problem as a guide and model). (2) A fair but modest grant under the Act will relieve the present stress and establish the principle of protected native areas, and possibly work so well as to make still further provision more easily procurable as need arises. (3) But, again following Stubbs, native areas must not be only the refuse of the land, but must include arable as well as pasture, and obviously there must be systematic attempts of all sorts to instruct natives and improve their agriculture.

With regard to the classes of natives to be provided for, Cape experience of what happens as natives advance in civilisation must be a guide. (a) Especially in the Cape—more elsewhere in the future, there is the kafir peasant who, in the words of the Scully Report, "has definitely accepted civilised ways." Opportunity must be made for such peasants, with individual tenure, and, if this is so, and the demand for land what it seems to be, the expense of necessary expropriation may be laregly met by means of quit-rent. (b) But there is also a growing class of natives, detached from social ties and tending at present to vagrancy. (How history repeats itself, and how little we learn. The squeezing out of the Hottentots from such feeble hold as they had on the land had precisely this effect, and produced just a century ago a strong agitation for laws to check this forced vagrancy. Bantu vagrancy is new, and may be even more serious; it must lead immediately to crime, and ultimately to ever more rapid "industrialisation" and even keener competition, even in the skilled trades which are now being thronged by Cape "Hottentots.")

Contrary, therefore, to some suggestions, I submit that individual tenure cannot and ought not to be forced, but that it is definitely necessary to provide additional native land to be held still on tribal or communal tenure.

To conclude. The urgency of this land question can hardly be exaggerated. The native, long-suffering and law-abiding as every one admits him to be, has been sorely unsettled and tried by the failure of the Government to carry out its own obligations under the Act, and by the chaos and uncertainty of the present position. Pending full inquiry, which ought to be next session, into the tangle of conflicting reports, and into the present working of the Act, the Government must act, with absolute impartiality, and without oracular reservations, where Crown lands are concerned, and use all possible administrative powers to fulfil the promise (contained in a recent departmental statement) of giving natives access to land in the committee areas. And it ought certainly also to make it perfectly clear to the natives how and where they can buy land, tribally if need be.

For the future, and with regard to the white electoral opinion which helps to tie the hands of the Government in taking further necessary action, I repeat: It is the highest possible white interest to deal justly and generously with the natives in this matter. There is no hope of solving the poor white problem by absorbing still more land, and no hope except in two directions (a) by doing everything to restrict the competition of white and black, which is possible only by giving the native generous room to develop on his own lines in his own areas, (b) by turning white attention closely and continuously to its own under-developed land, to the excessively large individual holdings in some parts, and to neglected areas like the south-west and south-central Cape. There is definitely no hope of absorbing the unemployed white population or of correcting the drift from country to town except and only by resolute abandonment of the habit of seeking yet more land on which to continue the old outworn methods. The only remedy is unremitting attention to intensive agricultural development.

With regard to the supply of native labour, I insist again that we want to be sure that by our present policy, especially by the labour-tenant clauses of the Land Act, we are not seriously misusing a great asset of industry by restricting its mobility.

Finally, while there is reason to hope that in a just solution of the native land question there is hope also, perhaps the only hope, of a solution of many white difficulties, yet the sands are running out. Even now the areas suggested by the committees are becoming more and more of a hopeless tangle of black and white. And worse, I have good reason for stating that in some important districts blocks of land suggested by the committees as suitable native areas are being encroached upon steadily by both the Government and the white community, and at the present rate of progress there will in 10 or 15 years be entirely absorbed by the whites.

VI.—NATIVES AND THE LAND ACT OF 1913.

Chief F. F. Zibi.

All the authorities on the native question are agreed that the land question is the native question. The natives are a pastoral people, who lived and moved with ease when there was no land hunger. To-day the scene is changed, and they are crying out throughout the whole Union for land. Contentment among the natives, better understanding between the white and black races, and the solution of the native question itself depend mainly on a sound and satisfactory adjustment of land rights. For the purpose of this question the natives may be divided into four classes: (1) Those who live on reserves or locations under communal tenure; (2) those in surveyed locations whose ownership of their land is conditional; (3) squatters in surveyed locations and on privately-owned farms; and (4) those living in urban areas.

Natives living in reserves and locations are merely occupiers, not owners, of the land. The Government is the owner. How they can improve themselves is a difficult question. I heard from an authority on the subject "that he would not advise a man to build a decent house on Crown land"—and these reserves and locations are Crown lands set aside for the exclusive use of natives. Furthermore, according to regulations that were proclaimed to be in force last year, the white man—in spite of the segregation policy of the country—has framed rules to govern in these segregated areas, the native through a white man instead of governing him through a native. "Develop on your own lines," he says, "but I am going to tell you what those lines are to be."

The rule in the surveyed areas is "One man one lot," and no provision whatsoever is made for increase. The result is that all the sons of the lot-owners are squatters. We have been held, and are held, responsible by both Government and officials for allowing squatters into our areas. I admit we are responsible—not for allowing squatters into our locations but for breeding them. We come now to squatters on privately-owned farms commonly called "morow com" (come back to work even to-morrow). What future have these people? The farmer wants them as long as they and their families work for him What if a man becomes an invalid? What about his wife and children if he die? Where are they to go These are questions the legislators should have asked themselves before they passed the law.

ORIGIN OF THE ACT.

The Europeans, the governing race in this country, have, through their Parliament, sought to solve the native question by first attempting to effect territorial separation of land rights between Europeans and natives, as the first instalment of the Union's native policy. This they did by passing the Natives' Land Act in 1913, a little over 10 years ago. The Act became law on June 19, 1913.

The official statement issued in November, 1913, on this matter, inter alia, stated that the Parliament had decided that an effort should be made to put a stop to the many social and other evils which result from too close contact between Europeans and natives. It is difficult to accept this statement as being the sole and only origin of the Natives' Land Act. On February 18, 1913, during the Parliamentary session of that year, the Minister for Lands was asked: (a) How many farms or portions of farms in the Transvaal Province have during the last three years been registered in the names of natives? (b) What is the extent of the land so registered? (c) How much was paid for it? The Minister replied: (a) 78 farms; (b) 144,416 morgen; and (c) £94,907. On February 28, 1913, Mr. J. G. Keyter, Free State member, moved: "That the Government be requested to submit to the House during the present session a general Pass and Squatters Bill to prohibit coloured people (1) from wandering about without a proper pass; (2) from squatting on farms; and (3) from sowing on the share system." Mr. P. G. W. Grobler, a Transvaaler, moved (as an amendment) to add at the end of the motion: "and further to take effective measures to restrict purchase and lease of land by natives." As a result of these the Natives' Land Bill was introduced and passed towards the end of the same session. The Bill complied with the motion of Mr. J. G. Keyter and the amendment of Mr. P. G. W. Grobler.

Considering all these origins as a whole, and the fact that the Bill was passed by a Parliament of white men only, we can safely say that the Europeans in this country became apprehensive, and considered that the development of the natives and the growing desire on the part of the natives would eventually seriously jeopardise the future of the white man. That, in my opinion, was the true origin of the Natives' Land Act. And it was passed with little or no regard for the welfare and interests of the natives, and no thought given to the increase of the native population and the increasing desire of the natives to acquire land property of their own.

Three points are very important to be kept in view: Firstly, immediately the Act was passed it stopped the natives from purchasing, hiring, or acquiring any land or interest in land outside the "scheduled native areas." This was in terms of Section 1 of the Act. Secondly, the Act contains a schedule of native areas in which natives only may buy, hire, or acquire land or interest in land. Thirdly, outside these scheduled areas no black man can buy or hire land.

THE SCHEDULED AREAS.

What are these "scheduled native areas"? The recent official statement issued by the Department of Native Affairs, to whose lot has fallen the administration of this Act, says: "The areas mentioned in the schedule of the Act comprised all the then existing native reserves or locations throughout the Union, and in addition much land privately owned by natives for tribal purposes." We have now got the answer in the clearest language possible. The scheduled native areas are the existing overcrowded and congested native reserves and/or locations plus much (?) land privately owned by natives for tribal purposes.

There is a wrong impression abroad that the Act protected native occupation of reserves and locations from being purchased or encroached upon by Europeans. A greater mistake and a more misleading statement could not be made. These reserves or locations have been granted to, and reserved for the exclusive use of certain native tribes, under certain laws. They were, and still are, protected by those laws under which they were granted to natives. The deeds of grant of these reserves are, like all other grants, filed in the offices of the Registrar of Deeds of the various provinces. The terms of some—if not all—of these grants clearly declare that these reserves are inalienable, and cannot be bought or sold, the reserves being exclusively granted to the tribes concerned. These reserves being inalienable, not even members of the tribes, for whose benefit the reserves or locations are held in trust can buy land therein. Under the terms of certain of these grants some of the locations could only be sold if the whole tribe rebelled, in which case the location could be confiscated.

POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

The native areas recommended by the Beaumont Commission were rejected by the Parliamentary Select Committee, on whose recommendation the local committees were appointed. The local committee reports " were received with the same antagonism as had been exhibited in many quarters . . . . towards the recommendations of the Beaumont Commission."

As already shown, the Act made it at once illegal for a native to purchase or hire land outside the scheduled native areas. These restrictions were regarded as temporary, and only to operate until the Parliament made further provision, acting on the report of the Natives' Land Commission, commonly known as the Beaumont Commission. Notwithstanding that, the Government has, according to the official statement, decided that " the time is not ripe to deal finally with the position arising out of the legislation of 1913." This is ten years after the passing of the Act, and ten years after " taking effective measures to restrict the purchase and lease of land by natives," no relief in the meantime being provided for the possible hardships and difficulties that might happen to the poor natives as the result of the administration of the Act! The restrictions that were taken to be temporary can well be taken as permanent, for the Government states " it would be premature to ask Parliament to set aside definite native and non-native areas." This can be taken to mean that from June, 1913, the Act was greatly made operative against the natives only, who were confined to buy or hire land in the scheduled native areas; this restriction was to be temporary. Investigation and the consideration of the matter in the meantime went on. Finally, it is found the " Parliament cannot be asked to set aside definite areas for black and white," while retaining the restrictions imposed on the natives.

The Government in 1922 decided that local committee areas are to be regarded as areas in which natives could buy or lease land. (Sec. 16 of the Statement). But the statement says, " it must be clearly understood that the Government does not propose to expropriate privately-owned ground within committee areas with view to making such land available for native occupation, nor does it propose to make free grants of land for tribal locations." And, " as regards Crown land in the committee areas the Government does not purpose to authorise permanent alienation without Parliamentary authority." And " time has come when it must be recognised that any additional land which a man or community now needs must be paid for, either by way of purchase or of lease." Privately-owned ground within committee areas not to be expropriated: no free grants of land for tribal locations: Government not to authorise alienation of Crown land in committee areas. Where then can the natives buy or lease land? The answer is in Section 16 of the statement: " Local committee areas are to be regarded as areas in which natives can buy or lease land." Now what are these local committee areas? They are the existing overcrowded native reserves or locations, with additional adjoining Crown lands and two, three or four privately-owned farms, which by the demarcation of these areas fell within these areas owing to their close proximity to native reserves or locations.

NO LAND TO BUY.

The policy followed by the Government is fully and clearly explained in the official statement, and on that statement's own showing the committee areas, as the law at present stands, are a mere theory and of no practical help to the natives. As I have shown that these committee areas consist of native reserves or locations, Crown land and privately owned farms, the Government does not purpose to authorise alienation of Crown land in those committee areas, nor does the Government propose to expropriate privately-owned farms within those areas, and, even if the natives have the money with which to buy those privately-owned farms, no farmer, under the Act, can be compelled to sell his farm against his wish. Boiled down, the whole policy comes to this, natives are practically allowed to purchase or hire land only in their own existing overcrowded locations or reserves.

The writer of the paper proceeds to consider the actual working of the Act and this policy, quoting statements to show that it is not only inequitable but also the cause of the actual hardships suffered by the natives, individually and collectively.

Evidently (he continues) a mistake was made in making and enforcing the Natves' Land Act before provision was made for the possible evictions of natives from farms as the result of the working of the Act. And now, this state of things has resulted in: (1) Other natives through circumstances beyond their control, have to enter into labour contracts with farmers under shocking, inhuman and unchristian conditions. (2) It has resulted in such natives wandering about with their families and stock looking for better places where they can get better terms. This

trekking about reduces the number of their stock and thus makes the natives poorer and poorer. (3) Great numbers of these wandering natives, or natives so turned out from farms, have gone to towns only to swell the great army of the native unemployed, and what is worse, some have become criminals in the town slums; some their homes broken —their wives and daughters and sons breaking away from paternal authority as the result of the undesirable influence of town slum life. Women have become illicit liquor traffickers. Young boys have joined the criminal gangs. One only has to go to native locations of big towns like Pretoria and Johannesburg, to see great numbers of men and women in their raw state, which is evidence that they are fresh from the native kraals in their locations.

The Natives' Land Act having done its "bit" towards harassing the natives and rendering them homeless in rural and country areas, and driving large numbers of them yearly into towns, the Urban Areas Act Act has now been passed which will have the effect of driving hundreds of thousands of natives out of towns, as only natives in employ will remain in the native villages in towns. The question arises now, Where will these people go to?

VII.—SEGREGATION.

[Summary of the Address given by Prof. E. H. Brookes, introducing the subject of "Segregation as a Fundamental Plank of Native Policy."]

In dealing with a subject like "segregation," it is first of all necessary to define terms. "Segregation" is used in our country in an almost infinite number of different senses—like "democracy" in general politics, it becomes, in the sphere of Native policy, a general and fluid term to describe whatever the speaker likes. It has been used to describe every possible state of affairs from our present system to one which would be the exact opposite to it. In the mouths of many active politicians it is a panacea for the ills of the Native problem; and as such is advocated with a hearty eloquence which makes it seem almost ill-natured to enquire exactly what it it is that the speaker wishes to introduce. Some years of research and discussion have convinced me that the most impossible of all the impossible people who discuss the Native question is the man who says glibly that "segregation will solve the whole problem."

Many people have used the term "segregation" to imply the general differential development of the Bantu, as opposed to race or culture-fusion. This is rather a dangerous extension of meaning: from the point of view of scientific clearness it is better to understand "segregation" as meaning geographical or territorial separation, and to coin a new term to describe the separate race development of black and white. I have, above, employed the term "differential development," and shall continue to do so in this paper.

Such a policy of "differential development" is bound to commend itself to a Conference of this nature, searching for a formula of cautious and moderate liberatism which it might commend to educated South African opinion. Adopting it, we are spared the invidious task of pronouncing upon the equality or inferiority of the Bantu as compared with Europeans. All that we are asked to believe is that they are different, and that each ethos is capable of an independent development, however much influenced by the other. We are not out to make the Bantu second-rate imitation Europeans, but better Bantu, with a race consciousness and a race-pride of their own. By adopting the formula of differential development, we oppose ourselves to race-fusion, the results of which have (as between black and white) never hitherto been strikingly good, and often strikingly bad. One speaks not merely from the physiological aspect, but also from the cultural. To destroy Bantu culture instead of developing it would save lazy European administrators a lot of trouble, but it would be a crime against humanity. To destroy our European culture in South Africa would be to impoverish the Bantu themselves, who would be far more inspired by pure European civilization than by some watered-down black-white compromise. By adopting the formula of differential development, we oppose ourselves to repression. We wish not to hold back, but to develop, the black race. "The path to right and left may be hedged about with as many restrictions as you like, *but the road forward must never be blocked.*" Otherwise we fail in our trust, and our nationality does not survive its acid test.

Applied in the economic sphere, the doctrine of differential development would mean a policy of minimising direct competition between white and black; of making each race, as far as possible, economically, complementary to—not competitive with—the other. This would lead us to a direct and active assistance of Native agriculture, including the provision of trained demonstrators and adequate marketing facilities for new crops grown. Such a policy would, by making the Native territories capable of supporting a larger population, ease the land problem ; and, by drawing Natives away from the mines and factories, increase the openings for unemployed Europeans—utilising, instead of deploring, the poor white "drift to the towns." Our present system of cheap Native labour in industries is gravely detrimental to white and black alike, and one of the most pregnant sources of danger to the future of South Africa. In Agriculture again, one could make a special point of developing among Natives such activities (*e.g.*, pig and poultry farming, market-gardening, etc.) as have hitherto proved attractive and profitable peasant industries, and have not become prominent features of European farming in the Union.

Applied in the political sphere, the policy of differential development leads us to support the idea of "parallel institutions"—in other

words, a gradual, but full and logical, working-out of the principles of Act 23 of 1920. This against both the Cape Franchise, which means ultimately the rule of Europeans by Natives, and the Northern policy of political subordination, which means the rule of Natives by Europeans. We wish to see Europeans rule Europeans, and Natives rule Natives, and common matters dealt with by common consent.

Applied in the cultural sphere, the policy of differential development involves a presentation of religion and education to the Bantu in a way suited to their traditions and environment (*e.g.*, the use of the vernacular in education as far as practicable, the avoidance, if possible, of European sectarian shibboleths in the African Church). This is against either the clothing of the Bantu in the ready-made suit of our civilization, fitting where it touches, or the leaving of him unclothed and untrained in his pristine barbarism.

Now what of segregation? Segregation is a species of the genus differential development ; it is differential development as regards the occupation of land. Unfortunately, circumstances are such as to make this the most difficult application of all. As a complete clear-cut division, it is impossible: such a division is not practicable in any sphere of our common life. As a partial separation it is practicable, but not nearly as easy to realise as economic, political, or cultural differentiation.

By " complete " or " residential " segregation is meant the division of the races on the basis of residence. In the black areas, no white man would be permitted to live: in the white areas, no black man. It must be realised that this means the complete withdrawal of Native labour from our economic system.

By " partial " or " possessory " segregation is meant the system of which the Natives' Land Act is an example—a bad one, indeed, as not being fair in its distribution of land or its detailed provisions—namely, the division of the races on the basis of possession, of rights to land. In the black areas no white man may possess rights to land: in the white areas, no black man.

There is a difference, not merely of degree, but of kind between these two policies. There is nothing sacred, magical or recondite about possessory segregation. We can discuss its details as we can discuss those of economic or political differentiation. It is a partial remedy applicable to one aspect of Native policy—the agrarian. It tends to facilitate administration. The overwhelming majority of us would be in favour of it, as of other parts of the policy of differential development, so far as it is practicable and equitably carried out.

When we came to complete segregation we are on different ground. Partial segregation leaves us most of the problems raised by the juxtaposition of white and black—economic, political, legal, administrative, cultural—still to be solved. Complete segregation presents itself

as a panacea. By its mere happening it will solve everything. There will no longer be a Native problem. Obviously the first point to get at is whether this delightful solution is practicable.

What a dislocation of South African life it would produce is perhaps only faintly realised by some of those who defend complete segregation as an abstract policy. Our experience since 1913 has shown us the immense difficulties attending a scheme even of partial possessory segregation. Complete residential segregation would mean that, from the barest principles of humanity, we should have at least to double the existing Location areas. What an expropriation of European farming land that would mean ! To make the expropriation a gradual process will, judging by the agricultural community's reception of the Beaumont report, not ease matters. Economically, the country will suffer to the extent that huge tracts of land now producing for exchange, will revert, in the present state of Native agriculture, to production for subsistence.

Next something of the difficulty of moving tribes must be realised. To double existing locations will not produce the simple results that segregationists predict. South Africa will still be a living chessboard of black and white squares. Blacks would have constantly to be crossing white areas and *vice versa*. Unless an expensive and harassing police sytem guarded the borders of white and black areas, the scheme would undoubtedly break down in a generation. On the other hand, the provision of large massed black areas would, on my computation, involve the moving of from 45 per cent. to 55 per cent. of the tribes from their existing locations. Everybody knows the objection which a tribal Native has to being shifted from his ancestral home. Tribes are apt to resist such transference passively or actively. Do we not recollect the Bullhoek incident? It must be left to your imagination what the effect would be of wholesale moving of Natives in the manner suggested all over South Africa, whether in one mad and catastrophic revolution, or spread over a series of unsettled and angry years. It is like playing bowls with live bombs.

Complete segregation means residential segregation. And that means that Native labour is to be withdrawn, not partially, but wholly, not only from industries and mines, but from the farm and the home. How is it to be replaced? Replaced it must be: our poor whites could meet the wants of either mines or farms, but not both. The housewife, except among the relatively few who can afford to employ white servants, must do her own cooking in a temperature of over 100 degrees in the shade, scrub her own floors, clean her own windows. The only way out would be wholesale immigration of the poorer type of white man from countries such, perhaps, as Russia, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia or Greece. This would not merely tend to destroy in time all that is distinctly South African in South Africa, but would add to the political and economic situation difficulties beside which the Native question would pale into insignificance.

Another point. It is easy to talk about complete residential segregation in the abstract. But, to come down to bed-rock, what political party is going to the country on a policy of complete segregation, naked and undisguised? What hope would such a party have of securing a Parliamentary majority? It would not carry a single farming constituency, because no farmer would be sure that his farm would not be one to be expropriated, and every farmer would be sure that he was going to lose his ordinary labour supply for something not immediately available, and when it came, of dubious value. It would not carry the votes of great industrialists, or those with large amounts of money invested in industries. Though its policy might, at first glance, appeal to the working man, as tending towards white labour, it is difficult to imagine him seriously enthusiastic for a scheme which would involve his wife doing all her own household work (in practice, if we may trust the experienced, his doing half of it himself under sullen protest) and himself being cut out of his job by some friendly Magyar or Rutlenian!

Neither white nor black is at heart really in favour of complete segregation.

But all the same prominent politicians go all over the country preaching segregation complete and absolute as a panacea for the country's ills. For heaven's sake let us have done with this hypocrisy. Let us be honest with ourselves. No level-headed and intelligent man can go before a South African audience and definitely advocate complete segregation as a practicable policy. It is, in reality, as dead as a door-nail, and the sooner we leave it alone and get down to practical politics the better.

For the advocacy of segregation, complete and absolute, has this unfortunate effect—that it draws opinion away from the consideration of the different detailed reforms necessary in our Native policy towards one enormous revolution which is, by its mere happening, to amend everything. Why worry about Native agriculture and industry and the problem arising from its competition with similar European activity, when complete segregation will prevent such competition by simple geographical means? In this Fools' Paradise we are apt to allow Native Policy to drift into unchartered channels and dangerous situations, waiting for the miraculous solution which never will come, and indeed never can come. The magic sword to cut the Gordian knot is not forthcoming: awaiting it, we forget to begin unravelling the tangled confusion.

Let us add that complete segregation, if practicable, would not be desirable. We have tried it under the regime of Lord Glenelg, and have discovered that its fruit is perpetual warfare along the frontier between white and black. While developing economically and otherwise on different lines, our black and white populations cannot and must not live entirely separate lives: the need (not indeed in industries for which they are quite unfitted, but in agriculture and in general

unskilled service) their brawn, their patience, their capacity for cheerful labour. They need our civilisation, our agricultural science and machinery, our educational methods, our assistance in learning the difficult lesson of self-government, our higher vision of morality, our religion. Not without the finger of Providence have white and black come together in Southern Africa. We want so to interweave white and black interests as to make our Native peoples part of the army of a tolerant civilisation, holding independent white and black units of culture, moving northwards—not, by cutting them off from our life, to make them the vanguard of a barbarous and retrogressive pan-African movement advancing Southwards. Choose! Life and death are in your own hands!

I ask you, then, to believe that complete residential segregation is neither practicable nor desirable.

A scheme of partial, possessory segregation is, however, a different thing. It certainly facilitates administration (*e.g.*, the Transkeian Territories) and as a principle I think we can accept it, provided that it is honestly carried out.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the Natives' Land Act discussion is to be separated from this debate, and I must try not to trench unduly on that subject. Let me say, however, that to my mind the great defect of the Natives' Land Act is not the failure to extend the areas of Location land, but the failure to provide a third and neutral set of areas in addition to the irreducible minima for white and black. I believe that in such neutral areas is one great hope for the solution of the land question. The attempt to make further areas definitely—if only potentially—black, has mined the work of the Beaumont Commission and the Local Committees, and stultified all attempts at an amendment of the Lands Act. I ask: is it not time to consider the possibilities of this third "neutral" set of areas?

That question will have to be answered when this Conference faces the question of the Land Act. In the meantime I am restricted in my handling of the subject to advocating that at least the integrity of the existing location areas should be respected and preserved. In this matter there can be no question of interest, although, indeed, the preservation of the locations is to the interest of the white population. Let that be. For here our honour and plighted faith are involved.

We have already seen that, while it is possible for example to attain to a system of practical separation in political development; yet that separation can never have the completeness sighed for by the *doctrinaire*. Even more true is this of economic separation. There must be many points of overlapping, and what is needed is rather the creation or utilisation of tendencies than the drawing up of lists of legal prohibitions. Most of all this is true of the land question. In this matter, whereon separatist critics have most of all concentrated their attention, a rigid and complete separation is more difficult than in any other. Geographical segregation is, I repeat, more difficult than

legal, administrative, political, economic or cultural differentiation. While we shall be well advised to carry out the possessory form of it so far as we can, we need not be surprised to find it fraught with more stringent limitations than any other portion of the policy of differential development.

Bearing all these arguments in mind, I venture to sum up my views in the following resolutions which I submit for the approval of the Conference :—

(i) This Conference is in favour of the principle of the differential development of the Bantu, so far as such differentiation is based on Bantu traditions and requirements, and is not used as a means of repression.

(ii) So far as this general differential development can be described as "Segregation" this Conference is in favour of Segregation.

(iii) Understanding "Segregation" in its limited geographical sense, the Conference believes that complete segregation is neither possible nor desirable. It considers, however, that a partial possessory segregation (i.e. segregation based on prescriptive or other rights to the occupation of land) while not providing a panacea for the Native problem is a useful subsidiary measure tending to facilitate administration, and it therefore especially recommends that the integrity of the existing Locations be respected and preserved.

VIII. SEGREGATION.

By the Revd. Z. R. Mahabane.

Although the Hertzog scheme of segregation has apparently been rejected or postponed as being beyond the realm of practical politics, yet the principle has been adopted by white South Africa. There are, of course, two or three schools of thought on this question—what may be regarded as the extreme school which believes in complete segregation, i.e., the removal of the entire Bantu population from its present places of domicilium and its final settlement somewhere in the Kalahari Desert. Here this population should be given a measure of local self-government along the lines of the Transkeian Territories' General Council system, and generally the Bantu population would be afforded ample opportunities to develop along their own lines, always, of course, under the guidance and control of European magistrates or commissioners. This might be described as geographical segregation; and, of course, it sounds plausible.

Such a scheme of segregation would be tantamount to the creation of a distinct territory of the character of the Transkeian native territories.

THE NATIVES LAND ACT.

Then there is what may be regarded as the moderate school, which believes in what is known as territorial segregation, i.e., the demarcation of several areas in certain parts of the country to be known as "native areas," the rest of the land being known as "non-native areas."

This scheme of segregation has been adopted by Parliament, and is embodied in the Natives Land Act, No. 27 of 1913, which provides for the territorial separation referred to above. The Native Affairs Administration Bill, 1917, aimed at further developing the scheme by setting up machinery for the separate administration of native affairs in the native areas as well as urban areas on lines distinct from those followed in respect of the general affairs of the country—a veritable piece of class legislation.

DIVIDING THE LAND.

Geographical segregation as opposed to territorial segregation would be extremely objectionable, for it would appear to constitute a declaration on the part of the ruling race that the African race has no right or title or claim to this land, and that this race is here only by the grace of the white race. This would certainly be a serious thing once it got into the mind of the black man. Moreover, the Bantu would certainly be unwilling to be removed to a dry, barren and desert country such as the Kalahari Desert. I have not the slightest doubt that the Africans would welcome a scheme of territorial segregation if the Natives Land Act, 1913, would be so amended (if not repealed in favour of a more equitable measure) as to provide for the allocation of at least 50 per cent. of the land within South Africa for native occupation The Natives' Land Commission of 1913-1916, appointed under the Natives Land Act, 1913, and presided over by Sir William Beaumont, recommended, according to the Union Year Book, 1910-1920, the allocation of 231,944,964 acres of the land for European occupation, and only 26,821,383 acres for Bantu occupation or as native areas. The injustice and unfairness of this arrangement is quite patent. The European population of Southern Africa is about 1½ millions and the African population 4½ millions. The Commission therefore recommends (and this recommendation was accepted by Parliament when it passed the second reading of the Native Affairs Administration Bill 1917) that 11 per cent. of the land be demarcated as native areas for the use of three-fourths of the whole population and 89 per cent. of the land for the use of one-fourth of the population. This is, of course, exclusive of the coloured and Asiatic population.

I sincerely trust, however, that we are not too late in the day (it is "never too late to mend") and the European population will soon

recognise the justice of dividing the land into native and non-native areas of at least equal sizes. In other words a more equitable proposition would be one which would provide for the allocation of say 50 per cent. of the land for native occupation and the other half for white settlement. Moreover, such native areas should be spread all over the Union as is the case at present. If this were done no right-thinking black man would take exception to the proposal for segregation along these lines.

REPRESENTATION.

But it must be understood that even though a system of local councils were established in native areas or Territories, yet the claim for direct representation in the legislative bodies of the land—the Union Parliament and the Provincial Council—would certainly remain.

The white races of this country have their several forms of local government, such as Town Councils, Divisional Councils, School Boards and Provincial Councils. The existence of these Councils does not deprive them of the right of direct representation in the legislatures of the land. The Bantu also claim the right of having a voice and vote in the Parliamentary management of the general affairs of the land, and the right of direct participation in the making of the laws for the good, orderly and peaceful government of the country. Local councils and occasional conferences of the so-called representatives of the Bantu population of the character provided for under the Native Affairs Act of 1920, will never satisfy the political aspirations of the Bantu to full rights of citizenship with all the rights, duties, responsibilities and privileges appertaining thereto. Political segregation is, therefore, out of the question.

NATIONAL SEPARATION.

The only form of segregation that appears to be desirable and feasible is one that is along natural lines, one that comes of itself in accordance with the laws and workings of nature.

This kind of segregation might be described as social, racial or natural segregation. Segregation of this description is already in existence and no one can quarrel with that.. Even as oil is incapable of admixture or fusion with water, so is social fusion between white and black, European and Asiatic, civilised and uncivilised an undesirable and impossible proposition. This contention is borne out by marriage statistics of the province of the Cape of Good Hope, appearing in the Union Year Book of the period 1910-1920. These show that in 1919 there were 5,837 purely white marriages as against only 118 mixed marriages, i.e., marriages between white and coloured or black persons. In that province intermarriage between white and non-white persons is legally permissible, and although race prejudice in what might rightly be regarded as the "model state" is not so strongly pronounced as is the case in the other provinces, yet mixed marriages are few and far between

and hardly ever prove to be happy. This proves the futility and folly, not to say, the disastrous nature of the attempt to enter into what might well be regarded as an "unholy alliance."

The Native Affairs Act, No. 23, 1920, introduced and entrenched what may be termed "political segregation" finally providing for the separate administration of the general affairs of the country. I call this political segregation because the principle underlying the measure appears to be an attempt to meet the political aspirations of the Africans and their exclusion from participation in the making of the laws for the good and orderly government of the country. The idea would appear to be : "Give the black man a measure of local self-government by means of councils and he will cease to clamour for a voice in the management of the general affairs of the land," consult his opinion and sentiment by means of occasional conferences in regard to any proposed legislation affecting his interests, that will satisfy the simple mind of these "child races" of the land.

This process of segregation is going on, and the latest legislative contribution in this huge programme is the passing of the Natives (Urban Areas) Act No. 21 of 1923, this being statutory recognition of the principle of segregation in urban areas. This may be looked upon as "civic segregation." This principle of establishing separate dwelling-places for black and white races commends itself to every right-thinking man, and it was duly accepted and endorsed by the first official native conference convened under the provisions of the Native Affairs Act, 1920, and held at Bloemfontein in May, 1922.

IX. RESOLUTIONS.

Unopposed motion by Mr. M. Pelem—

That this Conference of Representatives of various Christian Churches and races of the Union of South Africa, in meeting assembled, wishes to place on record its profound sense of gratitude, admiration and appreciation of the wise, timely and thoughtful appeal and invitation which has been addressed by the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches to the Churches and other bodies engaged in philanthropic work among the Bantu people of this country, calling upon them for co-operation and united effort and action in dealing with the solution of the Native question. This Conference would, moreover, and above all, humbly, but joyfully express its thankfulness to the Almighty God for the special gift of the Christian spirit of wisdom, grace and philanthropy which inspired and led the Rev. A. F. Louw to the conception and initiation of his grand idea and proposition.

This was seconded by Mr. W. W. Ndlovu, and passed with acclamation.

NATIVE EDUCATION.

This Conference recommends that the Government should as soon as possible consider the advisability of introducing a Native Education Act, the objects of which will be:—

(1) To place Native Education under the direct control of the Union Government.

(2) To provide funds to place the salaries of Native Teachers on a uniform and equitable scale;

(3) To remodel our system of Native Education so that it shall be characterised by the greater adaptation of subjects and methods to practical needs, and that a larger place shall be given to industrial and agricultural training, domestic economy and hygiene;

(4) To provide a special place in the curricula for biblical and simple doctrinal knowledge, which should form a subject of examination, as the Conference is of opinion that there is no force like religion for raising the Native, and greatly deplores the tendency towards the neglect of religious and moral training in Native schools due to its not being a subject of examination;

(5) To arrange for the administration of Native education under Government control by Advisory Councils on which the Government, the Missionary Societies and the Natives will be represented.

CHRISTIAN NATIVE POLICY.

This Conferencee of Christian leaders among the European and Native sections of the population desires to declare its utmost emphatic conviction that the only sound and safe Native policy for our country is one based on the teachings of Christianity, and would therefore impress upon the Christian Churches and other responsible bodies and persons, the urgent need of employing every means for educating public opinion with reference to this subject of supreme importance. The Conference would especially call upon the Churches to do all they can to stir up interest in missionary effort among their members, and to quicken their sense of responsibility towards the Native and his conditions and aspirations. With an eye to this end the establishment of Native Welfare Associations is heartily recommended, and the training of the young to take an interest in their fellow citizens of another colour.

The Conference further resolves to appoint a Committee to co-operate with the standing Committee of the South African General Missionary Conference and the Native Welfare Associations in order to influence public opinion, *inter alia,* through Municipal and Divisional Council Congresses, and to watch proposed legislative measures, and if necessary to bring influence to bear on the Government in order to safeguard the rights of the Natives.

URBAN AREAS ACT.

(1) *Regulations.* Resolved that this Conference approach the Government through its Board of Officers, with a view to ensure that no regulations, either by Government or by Urban local authorities, shall be gazetted until they have first been published and time has been allowed for the full expression of public opinion thereon, both Native and European, and that the minimum period of 7 days provided in Sec. 23, Sub. Sec. 3, is not adequate; and further that in the framing of regulations by the Governor-General, the Minister, or the local Urban Authority, the spirit of consultation should be observed.

(2) *Leases.* Resolved that this Conference urge upon the Government and local Urban Authorities that the system of leasehold tenure in Native villages established under the Act be generally adopted and generously administered, so as to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Native for security of homestead tenure. To this end the Conference urges that the Government prepare and submit to Urban local authorities model leases.

The Conference also commends to the Native Welfare Societies, the working out of a common policy as to the terms and conditions of such leases, especially with reference to period of tenure and fairness of conditions.

(3) *Building.* Conference urges that in the construction of Native Villages facilities may be given whereby Natives may be encouraged to build their own houses (and also that Native contractors be allowed to tender for the erection of such houses as may be erected by the Urban Local Authority.)

N.B. The words in brackets were added by the Conference.

(4) *Superintendents.* That the Conference urge upon Urban local authorities the exercise of the greatest care in the selection of Location Superintendents, as the successful working of the Act will depend in a large measure upon the securing of suitable men of broad human sympathy for these posts.

(5) *Reformatories.* That in order to make possible the carrying out of Section 17, Sub. Sec. 2 of the Act which provides for the commitment of habitually idle or disorderly Natives to reformatory institutions, the attention of the Government be called to the urgent necessity of establishing such institutions which must provide for both sexes.

All except No. 5 were adopted.

SOCIAL BETTERMENT.

(1) In the opinion of this Conference the conditions under which the Natives live in urban areas, and the paucity of the opportunities available to them for social improvement and social expression make it urgently necessary that efforts for social betterment of Natives in urban areas be inaugurated.

(2) That such efforts should aim at providing similar facilities to those provided for Europeans by the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. and that organizations for the carrying out of such efforts should be on Christian and interdenominational lines.

(3) That this Conference notes with gratification the inauguration of such efforts in several South African cities and commends the subject to the attention of the National Council of the Y.M.C.A. with a view to the extension and co-ordination of such efforts.

SEGREGATION.

Resolution on Segregation proposed by Rev. Z. R. Mahabane.

That this representative Conference respectfully recommends the Government of the Union of South Africa to convene a Conference representative of the Government, the Churches, the European community and the Bantu population to consider and report upon the question of the advisability, desirability or feasibility or otherwise of segregation of the races as the best possible solution of the problem of race adjustment in this country.

This was carried 28 to 7.

Resolutions proposed by Mr. Brooke.

(1) This Conference is in favour of the principle of the differential development of the Bantu, so far as such differentiation is based on Bantu traditions and requirements, and is not used as a means of repression;

(2) So far as this general differential development can be described as "Segregation," the Conference is in favour of segregation;

(3) Understanding "Segregation" in its limited geographical sense, the Conference believes that complete segregation is neither possible or desirable. It considers, however, that a partial possesory segregation (i.e., segregation based on prescriptive or other rights to the occupation of land) while not providing a panacea for the Native problem, is a useful subsidiary measure tending to facilitate administration, and it therefore especially recommends that the integrity of the existing locations be respected and preserved.

THE LAND QUESTION.

The Resolution Committee's resolutions on the Land Question were then read as follows:—

That the Conference resolve

(1) That it would call the urgent attention of the Government to the very serious unsettlement and anxiety caused amongst the Natives generally by the operation of the Natives Land Act, by the confusion and uncertainty with regard to its provisions, and especially by the failure to make adequate "further provision" as recommended by the Beaumont Commission and the local Committees.

It being the intention of the Act that any prohibition to purchase land arising under Section 1 of the Act should be counterbalanced by the power to purchase other lands to be defined by the Commission appointed under Section 2. The two should be inseparable.

The increased and increasing congestion in Native areas is intensifying competition between white and black in the labour market, and therefore it is in the interest of both races to proceed immediately to relieve that pressure by the provision of land for Natives.

(2) That with regard to provision of land for Natives:—

(a) The Government should give earnest attention to the possibility of organising financial help by Land Settlement Board, Banks, or other means, to facilitate the acquisition of land to be held by Natives on individual tenure.

(b) That it will be necessary for some time to come, to provide land for Natives to be held on tribal or communal tenure.

(3) That, in order to clear up the confused position that has arisen under the Act, definite answers be requested to the following questions:—

(a) What local Councils have been recommended to the Governor-General by the Native Affairs Commission under Section 5 of the Native Affairs Act, 1920?

(b) What local Councils have been appointed by the Govenor-General as the result of these recommendations?

(c) What recommendations as to land have been made by the the local Councils appointed?

(d) Under Section 14 of the Native Affairs Department Statement the Governor-General can be asked to approve of Natives buying or leasing land in areas recommended by the Beaumont Commission and a local committee if the price or rent was reasonable. Are there cases of the Governor-General's approval having been asked for? If so, (a) What is the number of farms bought or leased by Natives in Committee areas? (b) What is the proportion of Committee areas still occupied and owned by Natives?

(e) What steps have been taken to inform Natives of the available land in each area? How may a Native ascertain this information?

(f) Under Section 18 the Government does not propose to "expropriate privately-owned land in areas with a view to making such land available for Native occupation." Is it not, therefore, the case that action under Section 14 can be completely blocked by any individual European holding land to-day in such areas placing upon it an unreasonable price or rent?

(g) Has the Commission discussed with the Government the position of Crown Land in the Committee Areas, and has any land whether Crown Land or privately owned in these Areas been alienated or leased to Natives?

(h) Has the Government decided not to alienate any more Crown Lands whether to Europeans or Natives? In any cases, have there been alienations of Crown lands in Committee areas to non-Natives since the Act came into operation?

(i) Will the Government bring up the whole question of Native lands for the consideration of Parliament at its next Session?

These were adopted unanimously.

SELF-GOVERNMENT.

(1) This Conference believes the time has come for the State to devise machinery aimed at granting to all the Natives of the Union some method by which they may be enabled to have a voice in the management of their affairs.

(2) That in response to the legitimate claims made by their representatives, a beginning should be made in training the Native people on safe and wise lines in the forms of self-government by the establishment of Native local councils as contemplated under Act 23 of 1920.

These were adopted unanimously.

X. INTERVIEW WITH THE ACTING MINISTER OF NATIVE AFFAIRS.

Mr. F. S. Malan, who, during the absence of the Premier in Europe, was Acting Minister of Native Affairs, has sanctioned the publication of the following account of a deputation which waited on him in Pretoria representing the Conference on Native Affairs, convened by the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches.

The deputation was composed of the Revs. W. Nicol, D. Theron, F. B. Bridgman, Messrs. E. H. Brookes, J. D. Rheinallt Jones, H. S. Msimang and R. V. Selope Thema. The Minister was accompanied by Lieut.-Colonel Godley, Acting Secretary for Native Affairs.

The Rev. W. Nicol introduced the deputation, and said that the organisers had been moved to convene the Johannesburg conference because they noticed and regretted the increasing differences of opinion between the Europeans and the educated native in South Africa. The Conference had helped to bring these classes together and everyone had been pleasantly surprised to see how much common ground they really had, and how willing they all were to co-operate. Referring to the personnel of the deputation, the speaker pointed out that an honest attempt had been made to bring in all well-meaning sections of the Christian public, including Dutch and English Churches, Europeans and Natives.

CHRISTIAN NATIVE POLICY.

The Rev. D. Theron, speaking to a resolution on Christian Native Policy, emphasised the necessity of a Christian basis for all legislation and administration. If the two races were to work harmoniously together there must be no room for suspicion. Rightly or wrongly an impression had been made that the law differentiated between white and colour. The Conference would strongly urge that this impression be removed. The Christian missions had played no mean part in the uplift of the Bantu peoples, because they had made use of the only means for effectual human uplift, viz., the Bible. The natives readily acknowledged their indebtednes to the missions. Such being the case, the Conference did not think it presumption to urge upon the Government to consult the mission bodies of acknowledged churches in contemplating legislation for the natives. Both wanted the best for the child race entrusted to their care. There ought thus to be an harmonious working together. Missions had entered a new phase in their history. Just now a campaign had been organised under the able leadership of that great missionary statesman, Dr. Donald Fraser, a campaign which would have far-reaching effects. The missionary would, in the future be more closely associated with all that tended to the well-being of the natives than he had been in the past. He was naturally a factor that could not be ignored if the coloured races of the country were to be wisely guided. The deputation held that the Government would do well to reckon with this factor.

Mr. Rheinallt Jones presented a resolution on native education. He expressed the view that the time had arrived when there should be a national policy in native education, just as there was now an effort being made in the same direction in the education of European children. He expressed the appreciation of native teachers that the Government had anticipated Parliament by setting aside a sum of £60,000 for native teachers' salaries, which had made it possible to relieve the teachers in some measure, although there were adjustments still to be made. There could be no doubt that, just as the education of European children was being directed to a more definite meeting of their social and economic needs, the education of native children would have to be directed to meet the practical needs of native life. Mr. Jones concluded, urging that the co-operation of missionaries—to whom native education owed its existence—should be sought by the Government in all its plans for the development of native education.

URBAN AREAS ACT.

Rev. Dr. Bridgman expressed the thanks of the Conference for the Urban Areas Act, which was accepted as a serious effort to relieve some of the evils of urban conditions. There were, however, a few difficult points still awaiting attention. The resolutions of the Conference mentioned some of these.

Dr. Bridgman then asked the Minister: (1) If ample opportunity would be given for native and European opinions to be secured in respect of any proposed regulations under the Act? (2) if the Government would issue a model lease to meet the position which had arisen through the decision of Parliament not to grant ownership to natives—a decision which had caused deep disappointment among natives? (3) what was the Government's intention regarding the time to be allowed municipalities to meet the provisions of the Act? and (4) what steps did the Government propose to take to provide for the natives who would be expelled from urban areas? There were many such in Johannesburg—they had been de-tribalised and could not possibly be sent back "whence they came." Dr. Bridgman suggested the establishment of labour colonies.

Mr. Edgar H. Brookes presented the resolution on segregation. The conference had not agreed to segregation. Compulsory and complete segregation was an impossible aim, for the day of repression had gone for ever. Segregation was a geographical term concerned with land, and it could never be a final solution. The constant preaching of segregation had a bad effect upon the public mind, and resulted in the postponement of remedial measures in education, housing, etc. If only the question could be raised out of party politics, he felt convinced that the result would be a general disavowal of segregation. Mr. Brookes went on to urge the Government to call a conference on non-party lines, where the whole matter would be discussed. He felt sure that the decision of the conference would have an excellent effect in disabusing the public mind once and for all.

ROOT OF NATIVE PROBLEM.

Mr. Thema followed. He held that the root of the native problem was to be found in the land question. The Act of 1913 had worked badly. Many natives had had to seek refuge in the towns, and had created new problems there, becoming competitors with white labour in industry. Now, however, the white people were beginning to think that the future sphere of the natives should be agriculture. But the native areas were not yet declared, and natives were finding it difficult to get land. They needed financial assisstance to do so. While the detribalisation of natives was not desirable, they should be encouraged to cultivate land.

The series of questions put forward by the conference were then presented, with a request for a detailed reply at a later date.

Mr. Msimang spoke to resolutions on political rights. These contained no more than Parliament had already granted. The aim of local Councils should be to train the native people in self-government The Minister had said at the Cape that the natives were opposed to the

Councils, but this was true perhaps in so far as the less progressive section was concerned, but would not the Government recognise that the Councils would be excellent institutions as outlets for the energies of the more progressive section? "Let us show the stuff we are made of," appealed Mr. Msimang. Since each tribe wanted its own Council, he suggested that there should be set up local committees to watch social interests, and to assist the general Council.

MINISTER REPLIES.

The Minister was at considerable pains to reply to the points raised by the various speakers. The resolutions, he said, covered very wide ground, and detailed replies could only be given after mature consideration.

He welcomed the interest shown in native matters by the conference convened by the Dutch Reformed Church. If goodwill were found on both sides and an earnest attempt made to understand the difficulties, only good would result. He complained that sometimes conferences were called to exaggerate and exploit grievances, not to remove them. The conference the delegates represented seemed to have made an honest attempt to approach the questions in the right spirit. There was formerly a great deal of opposition in the public mind to missionaries and missionary effort, due largely to ignorance on one side and to lack of experience on the other. He was pleased to see that a better spirit was being developed, and during his recent visit to the Transkei he had expressed the hope that there would be greater co-operation between missionaries and public officials in native matters. In the past missionaries had not always met with full support either from white or native.

Coming to specific matters dealt with in the resolutions, the Minister said that in education the Union Government now had more control, since it provided the Provinces with funds for the expansion of native education. There was centralisation in regard to questions of policy and decentralisation in administration. The Financial Relations Act of 1922 provided that the Provinces must continue to expend on native education at least as much as they did in 1921. This was some safeguard. A Departmental Committee was now considering taxation proposals: to secure uniformity of direct native taxation and to provide additional money for native development. The sum of £60,000 had been set aside this year in anticipation of this and another £60,000 would be available next year. As revenue from taxation came in further amounts would be secured. The Government was thus afforded an opportunity of influencing native education policy. Already conferences of the four Provinces were resulting in uniformity of salary scales for teachers, etc. The presence on the Native Affairs

Commission of educational experts like Dr. Roberts and Dr. Loram, was a very great advantage. "Things must have time to grow, but much has already been achieved," added the Minister.

POSSIBLE CAUSES OF UNREST.

As regards the Urban Areas Act, the Minister ascertained from Colonel Godley that the Government regulations had already been drawn up and submitted to the Municipalities. After Dr. Bridgman had urged that there were some things, such as medical examination of natives, which might easily prove in the regulations to be causes of unrest the Minister agreed to have all the Government regulations published in the *Gazette*, and to invite observations thereupon from natives and Europeans concerned.

As the time (seven days) mentioned in the Act in respect of the publication of municipal regulations was considered by the deputation to be too short a minimum, the Minister said that endeavour would be made to press each local authority to allow as much time as possible.

Replying to the question of ownership in locations, Mr. Malan said that as Municipalities were to be called upon to purchase land for locations it would not have been right to compel local authorities to sell the land again to natives, and to have made it necessary to acquire fresh land again. It was pointed out by the deputation that the ownership question was accepted as settled by Parliament, but that the necessity now was for securing for the natives the most advantageous leases possible To this the Minister replied that natives should be encouraged to build their own houses, and, under the Act, they would be entitled to compensation in cases of expropriation The Government would draft a model lease, but, of course, local authorities could not be compelled to adopt it.

The Government was dealing with the matter of expelled natives and was considering the proposal of farm colonies.

As to the application of the Act, the Government would be guided by the evidence of any municipality's desire to deal with the problem of native housing.

SEGREGATION AND LAND.

As segregation and land are closely allied matters, Mr. Malan replied to these together. He regarded complete segregation as impracticable. A hard and fast line of separation was really not seriously advocated by anyone, and he thought that industrial and political segregation were equally impossible. On these latter points, however, there were differences of opinion, and no conference would secure a unanimous vote.

The statement recently issued by the Native Affairs Department on the land question contained all the information the Government had

to give. Parliament had not been asked to agree to definite areas because, as yet, there were necessary adjustments of boundaries to be made. The Government was acting on the Reports of the Beaumont Commission and local committees—their agreed areas must be respected with compensation where necessary. It would be a mistake to make hard and fast divisions just yet.

Questioned as to the sale of Crown lands in these areas, the Minister said that Crown land in Committee areas could not be sold outright without an Act of Parliament, but he had allowed natives to settle on these lands with a title as good as freehold. Eventually Parliament would be asked to confirm the titles.

He begged natives to realise that there was not enough land for every European and native to become landowners—more particularly cattle farmers. He had had to emphasise the fact that morning to a delegation from a conference on landless whites. The only solution was to use the available land better, and to let the surplus population be employed in various industrial occupations. The effects of the 1913 Act were being greatly exaggerated. In the Cape, Natal and Orange Free State there had practically been no change, while in the Transvaal the Act had only continued the old law which had been upset by a Supreme Court judgment. The Act safeguarded native rights in the Reserves. Never before had it been laid down that Europeans could not buy land in native areas. He instanced the case of Thaba 'Nchu, where natives had lost their land by sales to Europeans.

TOO ANXIOUS TO BUY.

Natives were too anxious to buy land. They paid extravagant prices, and in several cases this resulted in forfeiture through failure to keep up instalments. The days of mere cattle wealth had gone for natives. The native population had increased, stock had increased, but the land could not be increased. Other methods of subsistence would have to be found.

Mr. Malan admitted that there were cases of hardship, and especially as to leases in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal.

Colonel Godley promised to reply in writing to the series of questions put forward.

Passing on to political rights, Mr. Malan said that he had found several things on his recent Transkeian tour which had made him think. He emphasised that under the Transkeian system (1) all district councils are merely advisory bodies; (2) the general council has power to raise and spend money, subject to the veto of the chief magistrate. The 1920 Act was different, for under it the magistrate only advised. In the Cis-Kei there had been six village boards with the same powers as those conferred by the 1920 Act, but all six had

been abolished, as they had not managed their finances wisely. He feared premature application of the Act, and he had decided not to alter it—but to establish advisory councils, which would serve to educate natives in self-government, and to bring the magistrate into closer touch with native opinion and native matters. It was significant that tribal natives did not want the 1920 Act. Certain applications for councils had been received and were being considered.

At the close Mr. Brookes said that the Minister had urged better use of the land. What would the Government do to help?

Mr. Malan replied that the Government was encouraging the training of native agricultural organisers or instructors. Six had been authorised in the Cape Province, but there were few such to be found. More would have to be done to train natives in agriculture.

The Rev. W. Nicol thanked the Minister for his courteous attention, and the deputation withdrew after an interview of two hours' duration.

XI. STATEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF NATIVE AFFAIRS.

Pretoria,
14th July, 1923.

From frequent allegations appearing in the Press and from other statements brought to the notice of the Department of Native Affairs, there appears to be a great deal of misunderstanding not only on the part of the Natives but also on the part of Europeans in regard to the action taken and the policy followed by the Government since the passing of the Natives Land Act, 1913, to enable Natives to acquire land or interests in land under the restrictions imposed by that Act.

The following statement has therefore been prepared and is published for general information by direction of the Prime Minister.

G. A. Godley,
Acting Secretary for Native Affairs.

STATEMENT ON THE NATIVES LAND ACT, 1913, AND SUBSEQUENT ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY.

1. The Natives Land Act, No. 27 of 1913, gives effect to the policy approved by Parliament that there should be a measure of territorial separation of land rights between the European and Native races.

2. The restrictions laid down in section *one* of the Act checks the indiscriminate occupation of land by Europeans and Natives with its attendant evils.

3. Appended to the Act is a schedule of native areas in which no person other than a Native can acquire land or any interest in land without the special permission of the Governor-General. Outside of

these areas no Native can purchase, hire, or acquire any land or interest in land from a European, nor a European from a Native, without the special permission of the Governor-General.

4. The areas mentioned in the schedule to the Act comprised all then existing Native reserves or Locations throughout the Union, and in addition much land privately owned by Natives for tribal purposes.

5. The Act maintains the *status quo* as regards the ownership and occupation of land in the Union relatively by Natives and by persons (U.G. 47—'23) other than Natives—so far as that could be done without imposing undue hardship—" until Parliament should make other provision " in the direction of further legislation to be based on the report of the Natives Land Commission, for the appointment of which provision was made in section *two* of the Act.

6. The Commission (commonly called the Beaumont Commission), whose enquiries were delayed by the war, submitted its report in 1916.

7. In the following year the further legislation foreshadowed in Act No. 27 of 1913, was introduced into Parliament in the shape of the Native Affairs Administration Bill. The Native areas recommended by the Beaumont Commission were embodied in a schedule to the Bill, which after the second reading was referred to the Select Committee on Native Affairs.

8. After hearing a vast amount of evidence from both Native and non-Native sources, the Select Committee found that the recommendations of the Beaumont Commission could not be accepted in their entirety, and recommended the appointment of " Local Committees " to revise the recommendations of that Commission. Local Committees were accordingly appointed in respect of (1) the Cape Province, (2) Orange Free State, (3) Natal, (4) Eastern Transvaal, and (5) Western Transvaal.

9. The Local Committee reports were furnished in 1918, and the proposals put forward were received with the same antagonism as had been exhibited in many quarters on the part of both Europeans and Natives towards the recommendations of the Beaumont Commission as embodied in the Native Affairs Administration Bill.

10. The Government decided, therefore, that the Native Affairs Administration Bill covered too wide a field, that the various principles embodied in it might more suitably be dealt with in more than one legislative measure, and it would be premature to ask Parliament to set aside definite Native and non-Native areas until some of the other principles had been dealt with.

11. In other words, it was clear to the Government that the time was not ripe to deal finally with the position arising out of the legislation of 1913 until the recommendations of the Beaumont Commission and the various Local Committees had been co-ordinated and machinery devised for enabling Native opinion to be focussed on the proposals.

12. Consequently the Government decided that before further action was taken to deal with the land question the more helpful course would be the passing of legislation having as its object:

(a) the appointment of a permanent Native Affairs Commission with full advisory powers;
(b) the establishment of Native local councils; and
(c) the summoning of representative conferences for the purpose of ascertaining Native sentiment, feeling and opinion in regard to any proposed legislative measure particularly affecting the Native population of the Union.

Legislation was accordingly introduced on these lines and became the law under Act No. 23 of 1920.

13. In the meantime the Government, as will be seen below, has not hesitated to supply by administration action indispensable requirements which it was originally intended should be met by the further legislation foreshadowed in the Natives Land Act.

14. In July, 1918, General Botha decided that applications by Natives to buy or lease land should be dealt with on the following lines:

(i) If the land was situate in an area recommended by the Beaumont Commission for Native occupation, and it appeared that the price or rent was reasonable, the Governor-General should be asked to approve of the transaction.
(ii) If the land was situate in an area recommended for Native occupation by the Beaumont Commission or by a Local Committee (but not by both) the proposed transaction might be submitted for approval after close scrutiny, the likelihood of hardship resulting from a refusal being the deciding factor.

15. This decision met the position in areas where there was considerable identity of recommendation, but proved of little advantage to the Native interests in districts in which the coincidence of recommendation was but slight.

16. The position was consequently reconsidered by the Government in 1922, when it was decided that, in general, Local Committee areas were to be regarded as areas in which Natives could buy or lease land.

17. The present position then is that the Government readily recommends for the sanction of His Royal Highness the Governor-General transactions whereby Natives are to acquire by purchase or lease land or an interest in land in areas recommended for Native occupation by one or other of the Local Committees, and thus, in so far as these areas are concerned, relief is afforded from the restrictions imposed by section *one* of the Natives Land Act.

18. It must clearly understood that the Government, at this stage, does not propose to expropriate privately-owned land within Committee areas with a view to making such land available for Native occupation, nor does it propose to make free grants of land for tribal locations.

19. Speaking broadly, and excepting perhaps, certain readjustments and one or two special cases, the time has come when it must be recognised that any additional land which a man or a community now needs must be paid for either by the way of purchase or of lease. (U.G. 47.'23.)

20. As regards Crown Land in the Committee areas the Government does not purpose to authorize permanent alienation without Parliamentary authority. It recognizes, however, that Natives should be given liberal rights of user of such land, and has decided, therefore, that no further European rights shall be established. If an exception in this connection is made for very cogent reasons, other land equally suitable for Native needs will be made available.

21. This statement applies primarily to the Transvaal and Natal, as in the Cape Province the facilities for acquiring land and interest in land are, so far as Natives are concerned, exactly the same as they were prior to the passing of the Natives Land Act. In the Orange Free State, where Natives are debarred by law from acquiring an interest in land, the postion cannot be modified except by legislation. The conditions in the latter Province are engaging the anxious attention of the Government with a view to the law being altered so as to enable Natives of the Barolong Tribe to purchase or lease land in that portion of the Thaba 'Nchu District which was recommended by the Local Committee as a Native area.

EUROPEAN AND BANTU NATIVE CONFERENCE.

LIST OF DELEGATES.

DUTCH REFORMED CHURCHES.

Cape Province.—Rt. Rev. D. S. Botha, Mod. Syn., Professor J. du Plessis, Litt.D., Rev. A. C. Murray, B.A., Rev. P. G. J. Meiring, B.A.
Orange Free State.—Rev. P. van der Merwe, Rev. A. F. Louw.
Transvaal.—Rev. D. Theron, Rev. Wm. Nicol, B.A., B.D.

ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Archbishop of Cape Town, Bishop of Pretoria, Rev. Father F. Hill, C.R., Mr. Waldie Peirson, K.C.

WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Rev. J. W. Stonesham, Rev. Allen Lea, Rev. Wm. Eveleigh.

WESLEYAN METHODIST SOCIETY (TRANSVAAL).

Rev. J. W. Allcock Rev. Wm. Meara.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SOUTH AFRICA.—Rev. J. Gray.

LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—Rev. Jennings.

BERLIN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—Rev. H. Kuschke.

MORAIRAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—Bishop E. van Claker.

AMERICAN B. C. F. M.—Rev. F. B. Bridgeman, D.D.

PARIS MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—Rev. Morillon.

SWISS MISSION.—Rev. S. Bovet.

WELFARE SOCIETIES.

Cape Town.—Adv. O. D. Schreiner.
Grahamstown.—Rev. W. J. St. Stead.
Bloemfontein.—Mr. G. P. Cook.
Durban.—Rev. J. Dexter-Taylor, D.D.
Pietermaritzburg.—Professor W. N. Roseveare.
Johannesburg.—Mr. Howard Pim, C.B.E.
Pretoria.—Mr. Edgar H. Brookes.

INVITED DELEGATES.

Mr. J. D. Rheinallt Jones, Professor W. M. MacMillan, Mr. O. E. Bull.

NATIVE DELEGATES.

Dutch Reformed Church.—Rev. Lebona.
Anglican Church.—Mr. M. Pelam.
Wesleyan Methodist Church.—Rev. Simon Majozi.
American B. C. F. M. (Zulu Mission).—Mr. Charles Dube.
African Methodist Episcopal Church.—Rev. J. Y. Tautsi, B.D., Rev. S. J. Maboe.

WELFARE SOCIETIES.

Cape Town.—Rev. A. Mtimkulu.
Grahamstown.—Mr. Arch. Mbolekwa.
Bloemfontein.—Mr. N. M. Mapikela.
Pietermaritzburg.—Rev. D. S. Dlepu.
Pretoria.—Rev. Z. R. Mahabane.

SPECIALLY INVITED REPRESENTATIVES.

Transkei.—Chief Chas. Veldman, represented by Mr. Bikitshe, Mr. Shadrack Maleti.
Cape Town.—Mr. D. D. T. Jabavu, B.A., Chief Shadrack Zibi.
Herschel.—Mr. J. G. Sikili.
Mafeking.—Dr. S. Molema.
Natal.—Mr. W. W. Ndhlovu, Mr. W. Msimang, Mr. Dick Sibisi, Rev. Nbrija Kuzwayo.
Transvaal.—Mr. S. M. Makgatho, Chief Sibesa, Chief Moiloa
Reef.—Mr. H. Selby-Msimang, Mr. R. V. Selope-Thema.
Orange Free State.—Chief Z. W. Fenyang, Rev. Z. R. Mahabane, Chief Mopedi, Mr. T. M. Mapikulu, R. M. Setlogelo.
Pondoland.—Chief Pokleni.